ISLANDICA

A SERIES RELATING TO ICELAND AND THE
FISKE ICELANDIC COLLECTION
CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Edited by P. M. Mitchell

VOLUME XLIX

The Structure of Old Norse *Dróttkvætt* Poetry
By Kari Ellen Gade

The Structure of Old Norse *Dróttkvætt* Poetry

Kari Ellen Gade

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Since the late 1970s, scholars from Scandinavia, Germany, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States have shown a renewed interest in skaldic *dróttkvætt* poetry, and their works have brought new and valuable insights into this area of research. Roberta Frank (*Old Norse Court Poetry*: The *"Dróttkvætt" Stanza* [1978]) and Klaus von See (*Skaldendichtung*: *Eine Einführung* [1980]) have provided detailed introduction to the skaldic poetic genres. Bjarne Fidjestøl (*Det norrøne fyrstediktet* [1982]) has surveyed manuscript tradition and the internal relations between stanzas of longer panegyrics. Edith Marold (*Kenningkunst*: *Ein Beitrag zu einer Poetik der Skaldendichtung* [1983]) and Thomas Krömmelbein (*Skaldische Metaphorik*: *Studien zur Funktion der Kenningsprache in den skaldischen Dichtungen des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts* [1983]) have dealt extensively with poetic language, with special attention to the multiple semantic layers of the nominal circumlocutions in early poetry. Hermann Engster (*Poesie einer Achsenzeit*: *Der Ursprung der Skaldik im gesellschaftlichen Systemwandel der Wikingerzeit* [1983]) has attempted to provide a sociohistorical explanation for the emergence of *dróttkvætt* as a poetic genre. Most recently, Russell Poole (*Viking Poems on War and Peace*: *A Study in Skaldic Narrative* [1991]) has explored the textual transmission and narrative techniques in seven skaldic poems from the tenth and eleventh centuries. In 1983, Hans Kuhn published his major opus *Das Dróttkvætt*, the product of half a decade of research on different aspects of the *dróttkvætt* tradition, but, perhaps owing to the highly complex nature of his argumentation, that work has so far had little impact.

Most of the later studies on *dróttkvætt*, with the exception of Kuhn's monumental work and a more sketchy contribution by Kristján Árnason (*The Rhythms of Dróttkvætt and Other Old Icelandic Metres* [1991]), focus on literary and stylistic issues, and scant attention has been paid to structural aspects, metrics, and word order: that is, those issues which motivated the much publicized and rather vitriolic exchanges between Eduard Sievers and Andreas Heusler, Finnur Jónsson and E. A. Kock, and Konstantin Reichardt and Hans Kuhn at the end of

the nineteenth and the earlier twentieth century. Part of the reason for this apparent lack of interest certainly lies in the complexity of the material, but also in Kuhn's dominance in this area.

The purpose of the present work is to explore the structural peculiarites of ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* poetry and to reevaluate and develop further the many rules and laws that Kuhn posited for the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines and stanzas. I will address the fundamental questions of word order, syntax, composition, comprehension, and recitation, and will suggest a solution to the puzzles of the origin and the eventual demise of *dróttkvætt* in the fourteenth century.

The antecedents of this book go back to the early 1980s, when I started to examine the structural aspects of *dróttkvætt*. I did not become aquainted with Kuhn's 1983 work until my preliminary research had been completed, and, although our results overlapped in many areas, my own conclusions differed from Kuhn's in certain important respects. The results of these preliminary investigations were set down in my 1986 dissertation, "Skaldic Composition in the *dróttkvætt* Meter" (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis), and a summary of my initial criticism of Kuhn's work was published in *JEGP* in 1989.

During subsequent years of research in this area, it became increasingly clear that some of my earlier assumptions and observations were inaccurate and undeveloped. I therefore had to refine and reformulate certain aspects, such as the principles underlying my types of syntactic fillers, but my initial criticism of the parameters of Kuhn's approach remained unchanged. Because this book deals with the same material as the bulk of Kuhn's *Das Dróttkvætt*, a certain overlap is inevitable, and to faciliate the comparison for readers familiar with Kuhn's work I have adopted a system of graphic representation, as well as a denomination of types, that roughly corresponds to those Kuhn employed.

The first chapter provides an introduction to the formal and functional aspects of *dróttkvætt,* with particular emphasis on those areas that will be dealt with in the subsequent chapters, such as the problem of origins, word order, comprehension (recitation), and composition. The second chapter outlines the structural basis of *dróttkvætt*, with critical surveys of earlier works (Kuhn, Sievers, Kristján Árnason, and others). A system of graphic representation is formulated for use in the discussions of syntactic fillers in Chapters 4-6. Chapter 3 further elaborates structural aspects that are important for the discussions in the subsequent chapters, aspects such as resolution, neutralization, elision, "heavy dips," and syllabic cohesion. It also provides detailed criticism of Kuhn's "law of the caesura."

Chapters 4-6 contain systematic discussions of the types of syntactic fillers in odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines, according to the principles outlined in Chapter 2. It becomes clear that restrictions imposed by alliteration were responsible for the syntactic arrangement of the various types and for the difference in the syntactic fillers of odd and even lines. These variations in syntactic fillers were intimately

connected with the clause functions of the respective lines (sentence introduction, continuation, completion), and different types of patterns were used for different purposes: that is, to form parenthetic clauses, to provide the completion of earlier disrupted phrases, and to accommodate disrupted and suspended nominal phrases. I show how the fillers of *lausavísur* differed from those of panegyrics because of the difference in subject matter; how the syntax worked in terms of fixed patterns of placement of subjects and verbs in sentence introduction; how certain types of *kenningar* evolved because of restrictions imposed by alliteration; how sentence boundaries were marked by syllabic structure and the distribution of internal rhymes that must have been audible during recitation; and, finally, how the fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines compare to those of eddic *fornyrðislag*.

Chapter 7 focuses on the clausal arrangement within a *helmingr*, that is, how one line was connected to the next (in terms of Reichardt's vertical placement and enjambment). It becomes clear that alliteration was the most important structural device in *dróttkvætt* stanzas, and restrictions imposed by alliteration explain why some patterns favored enjambment while others could only accommodate vertical placement. Emphasis is placed on the different styles of encomiastic poems and *lausavísur*, as well as on the distinctions between *dróttkvætt* poetry and eddic *fornyrðislag*.

Chapter 8 contains a summary of and further elaboration on the results obtained in Chapters 4-6. I show that the features that characterize *dróttkvætt* (syllable counting, internal rhymes) were present in Norse territory in the ninth century and suggest how skaldic *dróttkvætt* could have evolved from eddic *fornyrðislag* by means of line-linking (enjambment), which was especially prominent in the earliest *dróttkvætt* (Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa"). The final section of Chapter 8 is devoted to the demise of *dróttkvætt*. In fourteenth-century Icelandic phonology, desyllabification of final -*r*, lengthening, diphthongization, and so on upset the finely tuned syllabic sequences on which *dróttkvætt* was based, thus causing its disappearance. Some of those changes are evident in skaldic poetry as early as the thirteenth century, and they could have been part of the force that prompted the composition of Snorri's "Háttatal."

I hope that the present book will provide a stimulus for future studies of eddic and skaldic (and West Germanic) meters to answer questions of style, mutual relationship, and genesis. Detailed surveys of *dróttkvætt* poetry from the eleventh to the fourteenth century would certainly establish criteria for dating and for identifying spurious stanzas, and they would also shed new light on the stylistic peculiarities of individual skalds and how the conversion to Christianity influenced the skaldic compositional technique.

The excerpted corpus consists of *dróttkvætt* poems from the ninth and tenth centuries as listed in Finnur Jónsson's *Skj* IA:1-174 (the anonymous stanzas [pp. 174-87] were not considered). The ninth- and tenth-century stanzas constitute a relatively small and homogeneous corpus, and they also represent the oldest

dróttkvætt stratum, which was of crucial importance in tracing the origin of that meter. Scholars have long recognized that the dating of some of these poems and especially of the *lausavísur* is problematic and that some stanzas could have been the work of later interpolators (see Kuhn 1983:248-63). Indeed, our analyses of the syntactic fillers and of stylistic peculiarities cast doubt on the authenticity of certain *lausavísur*. It is clear that a careful analysis of syntactic fillers across the centuries might help solve questions of dating and authorship; however, such an analysis falls outside the scope of this book. As long as no certain criteria have been established for identifying spurious stanzas, scholars find it difficult to agree on which stanzas belong to the earlier period and which are later forgeries. I have decided to include in the excerpted corpus all lines from the *lausavísur*, although I realize that some readers may find the approach objectionable. The problem of authenticity is indeed a real one, and it will be kept in mind during the following discussions. The interpretations of the poems rely on all critical editions and commentaries available to me, and for each stanza I have developed a new edition and translation into English. The lines and stanzas that were too corrupt to allow for a sensible reading without too many conjectures were not considered, and they are listed in Omissions (p. 267). The Appendix contains schematic overviews of the occurrences of the types of syntactic fillers. Unfortunately the corpus of excerpted lines could not be reproduced as an appendix to this volume, but it can be made available to interested readers upon request to the author. A guide to the technical vocabulary is given on pp. xviii-xxii.

The orthography of the *dróttkvætt* lines has been normalized, and contractions and abbreviations are given in keeping with standard practice, but enclitics are not distinguished by apostrophes except in the sequence genitive + *es* (*þess's*). The abbreviations of the names of the skalds and their poems follow those of Sveinbjörn Egilsson (1966: xiii-xvi).

The corpus of eddic *fornyrðislag* is quoted from Hans Kuhn's revised edition of Gustav Neckel's *Edda*: *Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern* (1962) and comprises the following poems:

"Vǫlospá"	(Vsp)
"Hymisqviða"	(Hym)
"Þrymsqviða"	(Þrk)
"Helgaqviða Hundingsbana in fyrri"	(HH I)
"Helgaqviða Hiǫrvarðssonar"	(HHj)
"Helgaqviða Hundingsbana ǫnnur"	(HH II)
"Grípisspá"	(Grp)
"Reginsmál"	(Rm)
"Fáfnismál"	(Fm)
"Sigrdrífumál"	(Sdr)
"Brot af Sigurðarqviðu"	(Br)

"Guðrúnarqviða in fyrsta"	(Gðr I)
"Sigurðarqviða in scamma"	(Sg)
"Helreið Brynhildar"	(Hlr)
"Guðrúnarqviða qnnur"	(Gðr II)
"Guðrúnarqviða in þriðia"	(Gðr III)
"Oddrúnargrátr"	(Od)
"Guðrúnarhvqt"	(Ghv).

<div align="right">

Kari Ellen Gade
Bloomington, Indiana

</div>

ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	*Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*
ANF	*Arkiv för nordisk filologi*
APS	*Acta Philologica Scandinavica*
Atti	*Atti del 12° Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo: Poetry in the Scandinavian Middle Ages. The Seventh International Saga Conference.* Ed. Teresa Pàroli. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo, 1990.
Beow	*Beowulf and Judith.* Ed. Elliot van Kirk Dobbie. The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, 4. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.
BGDSL	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*
BGDSL (T)	same (Tübingen)
Bisk	*Byskupa sögur.* Vol. 1. Ed Guðni Jónsson. [Akureyri]: Íslendingasagna-útgáfan, 1953.
ESS	Klaus von See. *Edda, Saga, Skaldendichtung: Aufsätze zur skandinavischen Literatur des Mittelalters.* Skandinavidtische Arbeiten, 6. Heidelberg: Winter, 1981.
Flat	*Flateyjarbók: En samling af norske konge-sagaer med indskudte mindre fortællinger om begivenheder i og udenfor Norge samt annaler.* Vol. 2. Ed. Guðbrandur Vigfússon and C. R. Unger. Oslo: Malling, 1862.
Gesta danorum	*Saxonis gesta danorum.* Vol. 1. Ed. J. Olrik and H. Ræder. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1931.
Gísl	*Gísla saga Súrssonar.* Nordisk filologi: Tekster og lærebøger til universitetsbrug: A.11. 5th ed. Ed. Agnete Loth. Oslo: Dreyer; Stockholm: Läromedelsförlagen; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1974.
Hel	*Heliand und Genesis.* Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 4. Ed. Otto Behaghel. 9th rev. ed. Ed. Burkhard Taeger. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984.
Hkr	*Heimskringla: Nóregs konunga sǫgur.* Ed. Finnur Jónsson. 1911; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1966.
IF	*Indogermanische Forschungen*

ÍF	*Íslenzk fornrit*. Reykjavík: Hið Íslenzka Fornritafélag.
	Vol. 2: *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar*. Ed. Sigurður Nordal, 1933.
	Vol. 3: *Borgfirðinga sǫgur*. Ed. Sigurður Nordal and Guðni Jónsson, 1938.
	Vol. 7: *Grettis saga Ásmundarsonar*. Ed. Guðni Jónsson, 1936.
	Vol. 8: *Vatnsdœla saga*. Ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, 1939.
	Vol. 9: *Eyfirðinga sǫgur*. Ed. Jónas Kristjánsson, 1956.
	Vol. 34: *Orkneyinga saga*. Ed. Finnbogi Guðmundsson, 1965.
	Vol. 35: *Danakonunga sǫgur*. Ed. Bjarni Guðnason, 1982.
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
KS	Hans Kuhn. *Kleine Schriften: Aufsätze und Rezensionen aus den Gebieten der germanischen und nordischen Sprach-, Literatur-, und Kulturgeschichte.* 4 vols. Ed. Dietrich Hofmann, Wolfgang Lange, and Klaus von See. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969-78.
MM	*Maal og minne*
Morkinskinna	*Morkinskinna: Pergamentsbog fra første halvdel af det trettende aarhundrede. Indeholdende en af de ældste optegnelser af norske kongesagaer.* Ed. C. R. Unger. Oslo: Bentzen, 1867.
MS	*Mediaeval Scandinavia*
SBVS	*Saga-Book of the Viking Society*
Skj	*Den norsk-islandske skjaldedigtning.* Ed. Finnur Jónsson. Vol. 1-2A: *Tekst efter håndskrifterne.* Vol. 1-2B: *Rettet tekst.* 1912-15; Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1967.
SnE	*Edda Snorra Sturlusonar.* 3 vols. Ed. Jón Sigurðsson et al. 1848-87; Osnabrück: Zeller, 1966.
SS	*Scandinavian Studies*
Sturlunga	*Sturlunga saga.* Vol. 1. Ed. Jón Jóhannesson, Magnús Finnbogason, and Kristján Eldjárn. Reykjavík: Sturlunguútgáfan, 1946.
ZDA	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*
ZDP	*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*
†	indicates a constructed or conjectural poetic line

TERMINOLOGY: OLD NORSE

aðalhending	'full rhyme,' that is, internal rhyme with identical vowels and postvocalic environment in even lines
áttmælt	'eight-clause stanza,' *dróttkvætt* variant in which each line contains an independent clause (*SnE* I:614)
bragarbót	*dróttkvætt* variant of odd lines with a trisyllabic compound in positions 2-4, alliteration in positions 1 and 5, and internal rhymes in positions 3 and 5 (*SnE* I:642)
detthent	*dróttkvætt* variant of odd lines with a trisyllabic compound in positions 3-6 (*SnE* I:640)
drápa	longer encomiastic poem with refrain (*stef*)
draugsháttr	even *dróttkvætt* lines of Type A, with enclitic inflectional endings in positions 2 and 4 (*SnE* I:640)
flokkr	longer poem without refrain (*stef*)
fornyrðislag	Norse alliterative meter developed from the Germanic alliterative long line
frumhending	first internal rhyme in a line
helmingr	half-stanza consisting of four lines
hending	internal rhyme
hjástælt	'pattern with sequential insertion,' in which positions 2-6 in line 4 are occupied by an independent clause that deals with ancient lore (*SnE* I:618)
hrynhent	expanded version of *dróttkvætt* in which each line contains eight syllables (*SnE* I:676-78)
hǫfuðstafr	'main stave,' fixed in initial position, even lines, in regular *dróttkvætt*
kenning	nominal circumlocution, consisting of a base word and one or more qualifiers
kviðuháttr	skaldic syllable-counting meter in which the odd lines consist of three syllables and the even lines of four syllables
lausavísa	'loose stanza'

ljóðaháttr	Norse meter with six-line stanzas, in which lines 1-2 (and 4-5) alliterate, and lines 3 and 6 contain internal alliteration (*SnE* I:714)
orðskviðuháttr	*dróttkvætt* variant with inserted proverbs in positions 2-6, even lines (*SnE* I: 636)
riðhent	*dróttkvætt* variant in even lines with a trisyllabic compound in positions 2-4 and internal rhymes in positions 3 and 5 (*SnE* I:642-44)
runhent	meter with end rhyme (*SnE* I:696-710)
sextánmælt	'sixteen-clause pattern,' *dróttkvætt* variant in which each line contains two independent clauses (*SnE* I:614)
skjalfhent	*dróttkvætt* variant of odd lines with alliteration in positions 1 and 3 and a long enclitic syllable in position 2 (*SnE* I:646)
skothending	internal rhyme with different vowels and similar postvocalic environment in odd lines
stamhent	*dróttkvætt* variant of odd lines with rhyme and alliteration in positions 4-5 (*SnE* I:658)
stef	'refrain'
stuðill	alliterating stave(s) in odd lines
stælt	'pattern with insertion,' in which lines 1 and 4 belong together syntactically, and lines 2-3 form an independent statement (*SnE* I:616-18)
tilsagt	'pattern with embedded explanation,' in which positions 1-4 in even lines contain an explanatory inserted clause (*SnE* I:634-36)
tvískelft	*dróttkvætt* variant with *skjalfhent* in all odd lines (*SnE* I:638)
viðrhending	the second internal rhyme in a line, usually fixed in position 5
vísufjórðungr	'couplet'
vísuorð	'poetic line'

TERMINOLOGY: TECHNICAL

base word	nominative substantive member of a *kenning* that is modified by a genitival qualifier
bisemantic compound	"Kompositum mit doppelter begrifflicher Kraft" (Andreas Heusler); compound that can be paraphrased in the sequence Q+BW or as a verbal phrase
bound clause	"gebundener Satz" (Hans Kuhn); sentence introduced by an introductory element (conjunction, adverb)
Bugge-Sieversche Regel	rule positing vowel shortening in hiatus
Craigie's law	rule stating that no long nomen is permitted in positions 3 or 4 in even *dróttkvætt* lines if the first two positions are occupied by two long nominal syllables; in odd lines, no nomen is permitted in those positions if alliteration falls in positions 1 and 5 and positions 1-2 are occupied by two long nomina
elision	poetic license according to which an extra proclitic syllable can occur in an x-position
empty rhymes	internal rhymes in which the vowels rhyme and the postvocalic environment is not identical
enclisis	post-position of words and particles
enjambment	straddling of the metrical caesura by elements belonging to the same syntactic unit
extraposition	constituent or parts of a constituent occurring outside the frame of the sentence, that is, they are embedded in a previous clause
formwords	"Formwörter" (Andreas Heusler), "Satzteilpartikeln" (Hans Kuhn); prepositions, proclitic particles, and the definite article *enn*
hard sentence boundaries	"harte Satzgrenzen" (Hans Kuhn); sentence boundaries not followed by an introductory element

heavy dips	"schwere Senkungen" (Hans Kuhn); long nominal syllables occurring in ×-positions
hiatus	concurrence of vowel sounds in two successive syllables
inverted kenningar	nominal circumlocutions consisting of a sequence of three consecutive elements, in which the first modifies the third or the third modifies the first
law of the caesura	"Zäsurgesetz" (Hans Kuhn); law according to which all *dróttkvætt* lines are divided by a syntactic caesura, which in odd lines falls between the alliterating staves, in even lines between the syllables with internal rhyme
law of sentence introduction	"Satzspitzengesetz"; "Kuhn's second law" to the effect that sentence particles must stand in anacrusis
law of sentence particles	"Satzpartikelgesetz"; "Kuhn's first law" to the effect that sentence particles (i.e., all unstressed or weakly stressed words that are not syntactically bound but function as syntactically independent constituents) stand in the first dip of the sentence, proclitically to either the first or the second stressed word
monosemantic compound	"Kompositum mit einfacher begrifflicher Kraft" (Andreas Heusler); compound that cannot be paraphrased in the sequence Q+BW
neutralization	two short nomina occupying a short position ($×× = ×$)
nomina	nouns, adjectives, infinitives, participles I-II
one-line clause	parenthetic clause that occupies one *dróttkvætt* line (lines 2-4)
proclisis	words or particles in pre-position
resolution	two short syllables occupying a long position ($\breve{×}× = \bar{×}$)
rule of syntactic coherence	(Hans Kuhn); rule according to which the nonalliterating lift falling between two alliterating lifts in odd lines belongs syntactically to the first lift
sectional clause	parenthetic clause in lines 2-4 that occupies part of a *dróttkvætt* line
sentence-concluding pattern	type of syntactic filler that concludes a sentence
sentence-continuing pattern	type of syntactic filler whose elements continue a sentence introduced in an earlier line
sentence-introductory pattern	type of syntactic filler whose initial position introduces a new clause
sentence particles	"Satzpartikeln" (Hans Kuhn); all unstressed or weakly stressed words that are not syntactically bound (formwords) but function as syntactically independent constituents

soft sentence boundaries	sentence boundaries followed by an introductory element
unterepische Füllungen	(Andreas Heusler); alliterative half-lines with fewer than four syllables
vertical placement	"Tiefstellung" (Konstantin Reichardt); disrupted parts of syntactic units occurring below each other in the half-stanza.
×-position	metrical position occupied by a formword or an inflectional ending

CHAPTER 1

Function and Form of *Dróttkvætt*

General Remarks

Most scholarly works on skaldic poetry are traditionally prefaced by one or more sections on the characteristics of that poetic genre. Because the present work deals with the structural features of *dróttkvætt*, however, I have dispensed with lengthy discussions of the literary and cultural aspects of skaldic poetry. This brief introduction is primarily intended for readers outside the field of Old Norse studies: it is by no means exhaustive, and the works listed in the notes should be consulted for greater detail.[1]

The term "skaldic poetry" is derived from the word *skald*, the most common Norse word for "poet." The origin of that word is unclear, and several attempts have been made to trace its etymology.[2] The most convincing explanation is that *skald* derives from a lost Germanic verb **skeldan* 'to abuse verbally' whose reflexes are OHG *skeltan*, OLG *skeldan*, OFr *sceldari*, and OFris *skelda;* cf. MHG *schelta* 'composer of derogatory poetry' and MLG *schelder* 'wandering minstrel' (see Wadstein 1895:88-89; von See 1964:11-14; Steblin-Kamenskij 1969). Whether the term *skald* indeed originated in the meaning "poet who abuses someone verbally" cannot be ascertained, but the cognates from the other Germanic languages and the connection between the skalds and the poetic genre *níðvísur* (defamatory poetry), as well as the terms *skaldstǫng/níðstǫng* (pole erected for the purpose of derision), make the etymology credible.[3]

Skaldic poetry is distinguished from Old Norse alliterative poetry, or eddic poetry, on the basis of functional and formal criteria.[4] Eddic poetry is usually anonymous and devoted to heroic, gnomic, and mythological themes from the past. In a few instances panegyric poetry was composed in an eddic meter, for example the anonymous "Eiríksmál," Þórbjǫrn hornklofi's "Haraldskvæði" or "Hrafnsmál," and Eyvindr Finnsson's "Hákonarmál," but these instances are exceptions rather than the rule.[5] Skaldic poetry, however, is rarely anonymous, and both the longer encomiastic poems (*drápur*) and the loose stanzas (*lausavísur*, i.e., stanzas quoted singly in the sagas) concern themselves with contemporary persons and events. Skalds frequently composed poems to honor a chieftain and glorify his deeds, or they used skaldic meters to lament and commemorate the death of a ruler. Such

praise took the form of a prestigious *drápa*, a series of stanzas containing a *stef* (refrain), or a *flokkr*, a shorter poem without a *stef*.[6] The *lausavísur* in the sagas provided the skalds with a tool for adding their own comments on personal experiences: they could deride an enemy (*níðvísur* 'poems of derision'), praise the beauty (or note the promiscuity) of a woman (*mansǫngr* 'erotic poem'), or extol their own prowess as poets, warriors, or lovers.[7] Skaldic poetry, then, could be used as a personal vehicle of praise or censure.

Whereas the content matter of eddic alliterative poetry was common property, rooted in oral tradition, and anonymous, the skalds were proud of their craft and conscious of the creative process of composition. Like rune carvers and artisans, they went to great lengths to leave their signatures on the finished product, often by incorporating their own names into the stanzas.[8] The poetic terminology shows that the skalds indeed compared their profession to that of artisans and craftspeople: verbs like *smíða* (forge), *stofna* (work, originally in connection with woodwork), and *fægja* (color, polish) were used to characterize the process of composition, and *bragsmíð* (the most splendid work) designated the final product, the skaldic stanza (Kreutzer 1977:135-48).

Eddic poetry relates heroic and mythological events, such as Þórr's fight with giants, the beginning and end of the world, or Sigurðr's slaying of the dragon, but skaldic poetry uses the same myths and tales as the framework for a complex system of metaphoric circumlocution, the *kenningar*.[9] Syntactically, the *kenning* can be defined as a nominal phrase consisting of a base word (noun) modified by one or more genitival or adjectival attributives (qualifiers).[10] For example, *Hildr hrannbliks* 'Hildr (valkyrie) of the wave fire,' that is, 'Hildr of gold' is "woman"; *Ullr Yggjar gǫtva* 'Ullr (god) of Yggr's (Óðinn's) garments' is "warrior"; *beiðir víns valkjósanda* 'craver of the wine of the corpse chooser (Óðinn),' that is, 'craver of the mead of poetry,' is "poet." Eddic poetry, too, contains poetic circumlocutions, but constructions are as a rule simpler and limited to such phrases as *Baldrs andscoti* 'Baldr's adversary' (= Hǫðr), *Yggs barn* 'Yggr's child' (= Þórr), *baugbroti* 'ring breaker.' Some periphrases in eddic poetry are syntactically and semantically more complex, for example *naddéls boði* 'offerer of the spear shower' ("warrior"), *brynþings apaldr* 'apple tree of the byrnie assembly' ("warrior"), *briótr berg-Dana* 'breaker of the mountain Danes,' that is, 'breaker of giants' (= Þórr). These phrases are few and most likely due to skaldic influence; on the whole, eddic poetry more or less reflects the same stage of development as do Old English and Old Saxon poetry.[11]

Unlike eddic *kenningar*, which rarely contain more than two elements, the skaldic *kenning* can consist of two components (*fleinbrak* 'spear clash' = "battle"), three components (*fleinbraks fúrr* 'fire of the spear clash' = "sword"), or more than three components (*brim dreggjar fyrða fjarðleggjar* 'the wave of yeast of the people of the fjord bone,' that is, 'the mead of the people of the rock [dwarfs]' =

"poetry"). The latter is uncommon, however, and seems to have been consciously avoided because of its complexity.[12]

The origin of the *kenning* system in skaldic poetry is unknown, and several hypotheses have been suggested. The *kenningar* were derived from the language of magic (Moberg 1942-43:201; de Vries 1941:74, 1957:19-20; Schwarz 1955-56:257-62), from taboo language (Ohlmarks 1944; Smith 1918:17; Portengen 1915:186-94; Kabell 1978:253), from riddles (Krause 1930:19; Lindow 1975), from imitation of Viking art styles (Lie 1952:37-43, 53; Marold 1976; Boyer 1990), and from the need to accommodate metrical restrictions (Finnur Jónsson 1920:384). More recently, the emergence of the *kenning* system has been associated with radical changes that took place in the social formation during the early Viking Age (Engster 1983; Poole 1990:184-85). However, although it is not possible to trace the origin of the *kenningar*, it is clear that the nominal *kenning* system is intimately connected with the strict formal requirements of skaldic meter, and that the *kenningar* provided the skalds with the tools they needed to fulfill the requirements imposed by rhyme, alliteration, syllable counting, and sentence structure (see also Mohr 1933:132-38; de Vries 1957:15, 19; Kuhn 1983:228).

Dróttkvætt meter was the most stylized and prestigious meter of skaldic poetry and was regularly used in both panegyrics and *lausavísur*. The earliest extant poem, Bragi Boddason's "Ragnarsdrápa" from the ninth century (*Skj* IA:1-4), was composed in *dróttkvætt* meter with certain deviations in the placement of alliterative staves and internal rhymes. The meter got its name from *drótt* (the king's retainers) and *kveða* (to recite) and, most likely, referred to a poem recited before the retainers at a king's court (Mogk 1889:109; Kuhn 1983:242-43). Because "Ragnarsdrápa" displays all the results of syncope, apocope, and umlaut, some scholars have argued that the poem is not as old as the early ninth century but rather it was composed at the end of the ninth century (E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971:15-18) or even as late as the end of the tenth century (Marold 1986; Bugge 1888:201, 1894:1-107). On the basis of the scanty information we have about Bragi, it is impossible to establish an absolute dating of his poetry, but in light of the consistent formal irregularities (which comparison with other *dróttkvætt* poems shows to be "early"), it seems very unlikely that "Ragnarsdrápa" could have been composed as late as the eleventh century (Kuhn 1969a, 1983:275-79).

Each *dróttkvætt* stanza consists of two half-stanzas (*helmingar*) of four lines (*vísuorð*), and the end of the *helmingr* coincides with the end of an independent statement (Konráð Gíslason 1872:304; Hollander 1947:300; Kuhn 1969c:63, 1983:187-88). A *helmingr* can consist of more than one sentence, but the syntactic break between the two half-stanzas must be stronger than any break contained within the *helmingr*; that is, if the second *helmingr* begins with an introductory element and is subordinate to a main clause in the first (MC:SC), none of the half-stanzas can contain the direct connection between two main clauses (MC:MC) (Kuhn 1929:200, 1969c:67, 1983:207). Consider the following stanza:

Vell 28	vasat í gǫgn / (þótt gerði	(main clause [MC]: subordinate clause [SC])
	Garðrǫgnir styr harðan) /	(SC:MC)
	gengiligt at ganga /	(MC:SC)
	(geirrásar) / her þeira;	(SC:MC; MC:SC)
	þás með Frísa fylki	
	fór Gunnviðurr sunnan /	(SC:MC)
	(kvaddi vígs) / ok Vinða	(MC:SC)
	(vágs blakkriði) / Frakka.	(MC:SC)

A *dróttkvætt* line (*vísuorð*) is regularly made up of six syllables, and each line ends in a disyllabic cadence consisting of a long root syllable plus a short inflectional (or, more rarely, derivational) suffix (see the words in positions 5-6 in the stanza quoted above).[13] The scheme of alliteration found in alliterative poetry is restricted and formalized in hexasyllabic *dróttkvætt*: each odd line contains two alliterating staves (*stuðlar* 'props'), the latter of which tends to fall in position 5, and the main stave (*hǫfuðstafr*) in the even lines is always fixed on the first syllable.[14] The principles of alliteration are the same for eddic and skaldic poetry: any vowel as well as diphthong can alliterate with another vowel (in Old Norse poetry initial *j*- was also treated as a vowel), identical consonants alliterate, and the groups *sp*-, *st*-, and *sk*- are treated as single phonetic units:[15]

Sindr 4:1-2	*sk*attgilda vann *sk*yldir
	*sk*autjalfaðar Gauta;
Haustl 15:5-6	þás *h*ofregin *h*afrar
	*h*ógreiðar framm drógu;
Rdr 3:1-2	knátti *e*ðr við *i*llan
	*J*ǫrmunrekr at vakna;
Eg lv 10:5-6	jǫrð grœr en *v*ér *v*erðum
	*V*ínu nær of mínum;
Eyv lv 3:1-2	*l*ýtr fyr *l*ǫngum spjótum
	*l*ands folk bifask randir.

Lines with more than two alliterating syllables are uncommon, but not prohibited (see Kuhn 1983:73):

Eg lv 1:1	þat *m*ælti *m*ín *m*óðir
Korm lv 9:5	*m*akaras *m*ér at *m*æla
TE 5:3	*e*n *e*k *a*t *u*ngs í *E*yjum.

According to Snorri, pronouns and such particles and prepositions as *en, er, at, í, of, af um, ok* could occur in a line with vowel alliteration without violating the meter, "but that is poetic license and not the correct norm."[16]

Unlike eddic poetry, each *dróttkvætt* line contains two internal rhymes, the *hendingar*.[17] The term *hending* is derived from the verb *henda* 'to grab, catch' which must have reflected the function of rhymed syllables, either in the meaning "to catch the ear" (as a mnemotechnic device enabling the listener to "catch" the meaning of a line) or "to interlock" (referring to the cohesive force of the rhymes) (Finnur Jónsson 1892:26, 1920:405; von See 1968:221). Odd *dróttkvætt* lines contain half-rhymes (*skothendingar* 'inserted rhymes') in which one or more of the postvocalic consonants in a syllable are identical, but the preceding vowels are not:[18]

Eyv lv 8:7	m*eld*r í móður h*old*i
Haustl 2:3	í g*eml*is ham g*ǫml*um
Haustl 7:1	þá varð *fastr* við *fóstr*a
Korm lv 38:1	esa mér sem T*int*eini.

In even lines, both the preceding vowels and one or more postvocalic consonants must be identical (*aðalhending* 'full rhyme'):

Gldr 1:8	r*íð*viggs lagar sk*íð*um
Gldr 3:4	barn*ungr* á lǫg þr*ung*it
Eg lv 6:2	ulfs tannl*itu*ðr gl*itr*a
Korm lv 33:8	*Eyst*eins sonum l*eyst*an.

The reflexes of u-umlaut (*a, ja > ǫ, jǫ | -u*) rhymed with their nonumlauted counterparts:

Gldr 3:2	h*arð*ráðr skipa b*ǫrð*um
Gldr 6:4	goð*varð*r und sik j*ǫrð*u.

The requirements for the postvocalic consonantal environment, however, are not as transparent.[19] It is not quite clear how many of the postvocalic consonants must participate in the internal rhyme: sometimes all consonants participate, even to the extent of obliterating morphological boundaries (Haustl 7:1 *þá varð fastr við fóstra*, Korm lv 33:8 *Eysteins sonum leystan*, Haustl 5:7 *ósvífrandi ása*); sometimes only one consonant participates (Eg lv 6:2 *ulfs tannlituðr glitra*, Korm lv 37:6 *hrannbliks an þér miklu*); sometimes inflectional endings are included in the rhyme (Hfr III, 7:2 *vígskýs en þat lýsik*, Eg lv 4:6 *oddskýs fyr þér nýsa*), but in certain cases they are not, although the exclusion of the inflectional ending from the rhyme leaves a long vowel (or diphthong) as the sole carrier of the *hending*

("empty rhyme"; Korm lv 10:2 *sefþeys at mér Freyja*, Vell 3:2 *Hertýs of þat frýju;* see Falk 1894; Kuhn 1983:77-78, 80; Kristján Árnason 1987, 1991:102; and the discussion in Chap. 2). There is evidence that the skalds themselves were aware of the consonantal quality and consciously tried to create rhymes of equal phonetic quantity and quality: in an episode from the eleventh century in the kings' sagas, for example, Þjóðólfr Arnórsson is upbraided by King Haraldr harðráði for having used the rhyme *grǫm : skǫmm*, in which, according to Haraldr, the *hendingar* are not "equally high" ("ecki er þat iafnhátt") (*Morkinskinna* 102).[20] In the surviving corpus of skaldic poetry, however, such rhymes are not at all infrequent, and it is clear that the skalds were not bound to those restrictions in their composition. Most likely the scarcity of adequate rhyming syllables and the attempt to avoid stereotyped phrasing forced the skalds to relax their standards and use rhymes that might have offended the ears of such medieval connoisseurs as King Haraldr.

Like the placement of alliterating staves, the placement of internal rhymes in *dróttkvætt* lines was restricted. In odd lines, the first *hending* (*frumhending*) could fall in positions 1-4, although rhyme in position 4 is very rare and restricted to one metrical type.[21] In even lines, the first internal rhyme never falls in position 4. The second *hending* (*viðrhending*) is fixed on the fifth syllable (the long root syllable in the cadence) in both odd and even lines. The earliest skaldic poems from the ninth century contain violations in the strict distribution of the *hendingar*. In the poems of Bragi, Þjóðólfr, and Torf-Einarr, there are missing internal rhymes in a number of odd lines, as in the following examples:

Rdr 1:1	viljð Hrafnketill heyra
Haustl 1:1	hvé skalk góðs at gjǫldum
TE 1:1	sékat Hrólfs ór hendi.

Sometimes a syllable is carried over to rhyme with a syllable in the following line (Kuhn 1983:88):

Rdr 13:3-4	svát af renni*rauk*num ‖
	rauk Danmarkar *auk*a
Rdr 12:1-2	þá má sókn á Svǫ*l*nis ‖
	sa*l*penningi kenna
Eg lv 43:7-8	máttit bǫls of b*ind*ask ‖
	Bl*undr* ek slíkt of *undr*umk.

In the earliest poetry, the *viðrhending* could also fall on the third syllable:[22]

Rdr 5:7	hǫ*rð*um he*rð*imýlum
Rdr 16:1	va*ðr* lá Vi*ðr*is arfa
Rdr 8:7	b*ar* til b*yr*jar drǫsla.

It is generally agreed that both the internal rhymes and the cadence were emphasized and distinct during recitation, but just how that effect was achieved is unknown (Craigie 1900:378; Finnur Jónsson 1920:340; Heusler 1956:293; Jón Helgason 1953:22; Hollander 1953:190; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1976:lxxvi; Kuhn 1969b:403, 1983:85).

The Origin of Dróttkvætt

The fact that *dróttkvætt* poetry, unlike Germanic alliterative poetry, depends on syllable counting and employs a strict system of internal rhymes has led to numerous speculations about the origin of this genre. The earliest extant poem composed in *dróttkvætt* meter is Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa" from the ninth century and, according to tradition, Bragi is revered as the first skald.[23] Because "Ragnarsdrápa" contains all the features of strict *dróttkvætt* meter (although with minor licenses), some scholars have been of the opinion that Bragi indeed was the first to compose a *dróttkvætt* stanza in the form as we know it (Heusler 1956:300; Lie 1952:7-8; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971:17; Kuhn 1983:275-76 leaves the question open). Others argue that "Ragnarsdrápa" displays sophisticated features that must have developed over a considerable period of time (de Vries 1957). There is evidence that poets before Bragi were characterized as skalds, notably Bragi's father-in-law, Erpr lútandi, but we know nothing about what type of poetry he might have composed, because the poets composing in eddic meters were also referred to as skalds.[24]

It has been suggested that skaldic poetry evolved from pagan religious poetry and magic practice (van Hamel 1928-36:141; E. Noreen 1922:1-13; de Vries 1957:24-25; von See 1967:41), or as a conscious imitation of Viking art (Lie 1952:19-24), but since the end of the nineteenth century this area of skaldic research has been dominated by two schools: those who trace the skaldic peculiarities back to Irish influence (Edzardi 1878; Bugge 1894:65-66; Hildebrand 1874:77-78; Heusler 1941:28-29, 1956:287, 299-300, 312-13; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971; Marold 1976:472; Mackenzie 1981), and those who see the evolution of *dróttkvætt* as an indigenous development of the Germanic long line (Finnur Jónsson 1890:123, 1920:403; Genzmer 1930:166; Reichardt 1928:67-68; Kuhn 1969a:211; Frank 1978:34-35). In the most recent and most exhaustive contribution to the study of skaldic poetry, Hans Kuhn (1983) demonstrated that *dróttkvætt* indeed shares all the fundamental features of alliterative poetry as exemplified by the eddic meter *fornyrðislag*, except for the internal rhymes, the principle of syllable counting, and the fixed cadence in positions 5-6. Kuhn's attempt to explain these peculiarities as Irish imports is not very convincing, and his work contains no discussion of the features that the Irish and the Norse traditions supposedly have in common.[25] In that respect, Kuhn is not alone: indeed Norse scholars seem to avoid

the issue, and in the books on skaldic poetry it is often relegated to a brief statement or a footnote.[26] The reluctance to deal with the Hiberno-Norse controversy is regrettable but understandable, for many of the attempts to link the Norse and Irish traditions have foundered on scholars' lack of knowledge about the other poetic tradition and their reliance on more or less respectable secondary sources.[27] The following observations on Irish poetry, too, are gleaned in their entirety from the available secondary sources, but, because the controversy at hand has some bearing on matters discussed later in this book, a more detailed discussion is necessary at this point.[28]

Ninth-century Irish poetry does indeed contain all the features that distinguish *dróttkvætt* from eddic *fornyrðislag*: it is characterized by rhymed stanzaic verses with a fixed number of syllables and a rhyming foot of fixed rhythm at the end of corresponding lines, and it contains internal rhyme as well as alliteration.[29] The realization of internal rhymes, syllable counting, and cadence appears to have been different in Old Irish poetry, however. According to Murphy (1973:30), rhyme in Irish "normally begins with the first stressed vowel of the riming word. From then on, every vowel must normally be identical (the identity including identity of quantity), and every consonant (when the consonants are single and not in groups) must normally be balanced by a consonant belonging to the same phonetic class and having the same quality."[30] Irish poetry also contains consonance, rhymes in which the vowels can be different, but the consonants rhyme according to the same principles as in the full rhymes (Murphy 1973:33-36; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971:11).

In Irish rhymes, then, attention was paid to the phonetic classification of consonants, not to phonetic identity, as in Old Norse. In that respect, the principles governing the rhymes in the earliest *dróttkvætt* ("Ragnarsdrápa") seem to have had more in common with the Irish Latin ecclesiatical poetry. Consider the following stanza from Óengus mac Tipraiti's (d. 745) hymn to Saint Martin and the lines from "Ragnarsdrápa":[31]

> Martinus mirus m**ore**
> **ore** laud**avit** d**eum**
> puro corde cant**avit**
> atque am**avit eum**;

Rdr 13:3-4	svát af renni**rauk**num
	rauk Danmarkar **auk**a;
Rdr 12:1-2	þá má sókn á Svǫlnis
	s**alpenn**ingi k**enn**a.

The combination of rhymes in Óengus's poem (from the end of one line to the beginning of the next) is a device from the vernacular tradition called *aicill*

(Murphy 1973:83). It differs from Bragi's line, however, in that it employs end rhyme. Furthermore, in the Latin poem, a new rhyme begins in the even line and is repeated in the following odd line. That never occurs in *dróttkvætt*, in which the rhyme from the odd line can be repeated in the following even line, but never vice versa (see the discussion in Kuhn 1983:87-88).

Whereas *dróttkvætt* lines consist of six syllables, the most frequent number of syllables in Irish verse is seven (Thurneysen 1891:147). Six syllables ending in a disyllabic word occurr in Old Irish, too, in the meter *rinnard*, as demonstrated by the following stanza from the eighth-century Martyrology of Oengus, "Félire Oengusso" (quoted from Knott and Murphy 1966:43):

> Cid a tír i taam
>   ata saidbri s*aigthe*,
>   di neurt Dé, deilm sochlae
>   fil and dún ro pr*aidche*.

Thurneysen describes *rinnard* as a frequently used meter, but he maintains that lines consisting of seven syllables are by far the most common, and, in Murphy's representative selection of Irish syllabic meters, the meters containing six syllables number less than 10 percent (see Thurneysen 1891:142, 147; Murphy 1973:48-73). According to E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:13), the fact that most Irish lines have seven syllables whereas the *dróttkvætt* line has six syllables is unimportant, and the difference may have originated in poetic taste and in the nature of the two languages. But he makes no attempt to explain what linguistic properties of Old Norse could have prompted the adoption of a hexasyllabic rather than a heptasyllabic line, and the fact remains that, although both the Old Irish and the Old Norse poetic traditions employed syllable counting, the earliest Norse type of such poetry, *dróttkvætt*, is structured differently from most of the Irish meters.

The cadence in *dróttkvætt* always consists of a long root syllable with a short inflectional or derivational suffix. In Old Irish the final foot has a fixed rhythm, but that foot can be monosyllabic or polysyllabic, as well as disyllabic, and in most cases the final syllable(s) carries end rhyme (Thurneysen 1891:139-47; Murphy 1973:48-73; de Vries 1957:16-17; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971:7, 13; Einar Ól. Sveinsson 1975). Consider the following stanza (quoted from Knott and Murphy 1966:43):

> Borg Emna ro ***tetha***
>   acht mairte a ***clocha***
>   is rúam iarthair ***betha***
>   Glenn dálach dá ***locha***.

In Norse *dróttkvætt*, end rhyme can only occur if the *frumhending* is disyllabic (i.e., the *frumhending* and the *viðrhending* have identical endings) :[32]

Rdr 5:2	golf**hǫlkvis** sá **fylkis**
Rdr 15:4	**endi**seiðs of **kenndi**
Gldr 6:7	**lindi**hjǫrt fyr **landi**.

According to Kuhn's calculations (1983:83-84), only 260 of the *dróttkvætt* lines from the ninth to the eleventh century contain such rhymes, and he concludes that, whereas this number shows that the skalds did not avoid end rhyme, they certainly did not favor it as an ornamental device. Not until the tenth century, in Egill's "Hǫfuðlausn" (*Skj* IA:35-39), does end rhyme play a constitutive part in skaldic metrics. This new meter, *runhent*, which consists of lines with four syllables and the alliterative patterns of eddic *fornyrðislag*, dispenses with internal rhyme altogether and replaces it with end rhyme (Sievers 1893:114-16; Heusler 1956:289; Kuhn 1983:334-36; Kristján Árnason 1991:60-63, 164):

Eg Hfl 1:1-2	vestr komk of **ver**
	en ek Viðris **ber**;
Eg Hfl 19:3-4	hjǫrleiks **hvati**
	hanns baug**skati**.

Most scholars agree that Egill invented the new meter in England under the influence of Latin church poetry, and some have argued that perhaps English or Irish rhyming poetry served as a model.[33] And, although the end rhymes in *runhent* differ from the Irish end rhymes in the same way as the *hendingar* differ from Irish internal rhyme (in the phonetic quality of the post vocalic environment), certain Irish meters do present quite striking parallels to *runhent*:[34]

| Isimda duine **data** | 7 cuire iscial**brata** |
| isimda samthach **fata** | icsluag dabchach diar**mata**. |

Whether Egill used late Latin ecclesiastical poetry or Irish poetry as his model is a question that must be left unanswered. It is clear, however, that *runhent* meter represented a bold break with the established norms for the composition of skaldic poetry, and this innovation was most likely a result of foreign influence.

As one can see from this discussion , the structural ties between Old Irish poetry and Old Norse *dróttkvætt* are present but not very strong. Both traditions employed internal rhymes, but these rhymes were realized differently, and it seems unlikely that the Old Irish rhymes, based as they were on vowel identity and similar consonantal distinctive features, could have prompted the creation of the structurally different Norse *hending* system. Old Irish poetry also contains end

rhymes, and it is not clear why the skalds, if they consciously chose to adopt rhyme as an adornment, did not choose to imitate end rhyme, which most likely would have been more prominent in the line since it falls on the fixed cadence (cf. the creation of *runhent* meter). Furthermore, whereas the cadence in Old Norse *dróttkvætt* had only one possible syllabic realization (long root syllable plus a short inflectional/derivational syllable), the Old Irish lines could end in a monosyllabic, disyllabic, or a polysyllabic word, and the disyllabic ending was by no means the most frequent (cf. the examples listed by Thurneysen 1891:139-66). Most Irish lines are heptasyllabic, the *dróttkvætt* line is hexasyllabic.

Most scholars concede that the character of the Hiberno-Norse relations in the first part of the ninth century would certainly have prevented any cultural exchange, and they therefore date "Ragnarsdrápa" to the end of the ninth century, when such interaction could have been possible.[35] The date of "Ragnarsdrápa" cannot be determined with certainty, however, and there is no evidence that *dróttkvætt* originated in the creative endeavors of one single individual, namely Bragi. As de Vries (1957) pointed out, both the diction and the meter of "Ragnarsdrápa" reflect a sophisticated stage of composition, which makes it very unlikely that the work could have been developed within the time span of a decade. De Vries, who traced the origins of *dróttkvætt* and the *kenning* system to cultic practice, did not exclude the possibility that the formal features characterizing that meter could have developed under Irish influence, but he suggests that this development took place as early as 750 in the Northern Isles, where the Celts and the Norsepeople allegedly lived in peaceful symbiosis (de Vries 1957:25; Foote 1984:239). That argument rests on inconclusive archaeological evidence and can neither be affirmed nor rejected. It remains speculative.[36]

We must conclude then that whereas Irish influence on the creation of *dróttkvætt* meter (in terms of syllable counting, fixed cadence, and internal rhymes) cannot be ruled out, the shared formal features are not prominent enough to make that connection credible. Nor is it quite clear when and where this alleged cultural exchange would have taken place. Unless further documentation (literary, archaeological) can be provided to support a Hiberno-Norse literary connection, it seems more fruitful to explore the second scholarly thesis, which poses the question whether the origins of *dróttkvætt* could lie in an indigenous development within the Old Norse tradition of alliterative poetry and the structural peculiarities that characterize *dróttkvætt* can be explained as an extension of the alliterative tradition.

In a recent contribution to this debate, Kristján Árnason proposes to "discuss the emergence of the skaldic set, as either a borrowing from some other tradition or as developed internally in the Nordic tradition" (1991:44). His results are not very illuminating, however. He writes (1991:88): "We must then conclude that the origin of the dróttkvætt metre is 'prehistoric,' and the methods available do not make it possible for us to judge it as a whole or even the individual strands of its

texture as clearly borrowed or clearly inherent. At the time of the earliest records, dróttkvætt emerges as a fully developed metre on a par with the Eddic fornyrðislag and ljóðaháttr, and we have no clear Nordic or foreign models." As I will show in the following chapters, this conclusion must be attributed to certain misconceptions about the structure of eddic and skaldic poetry.

Word Order and Sentence Structure in Dróttkvætt *Stanzas*

The word order in *dróttkvætt* stanzas can be quite convoluted, and intercalated sentences and embedded sentence elements can be dispersed at various places throughout a *helmingr*. The seemingly chaotic syntactic patterns have frustrated scholars, and, although many have been at pains to formulate rules and laws for the word order in *dróttkvætt* poetry, there is no consensus on the general applicability or even validity of these laws and rules.[37] As one scholar puts it, "Despite efforts over the last fifty years to legislate a set of syntactical and lexical laws, no single rule seems to work for all the poetry" (Frank 1985:169). As a basis for the later discussions of the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines (Chap. 4-6), the following sections outline the problems involved and provide an overview of the research in this area of skaldic scholarship.[38]

The intricate word order that characterizes *dróttkvætt* is evident even in the earliest poems:

Rdr 20
hinn es varp á víða
vinda ǫndurdísar
of manna sjǫt margra
mundlaug fǫður augum.

In this half-stanza, which may be translated literally as 'he who cast onto the wide of the winds—of the ski goddess—above men's dwellings—many—bowl—father's eyes', the words *á víða mundlaug vinda* (onto the wide bowl of the winds, i.e., 'onto the sky'), *ǫndurdísar fǫður augum* (the eyes of the father of the ski goddess, i.e., the eyes of the giant Þjazi), and *of margra manna sjǫt* (above the dwellings of many men) go together. In Rdr 13:5-8, the disrupted phrases are separated by an embedded clause:

Rdr 13:5-8
báru øxn ok átta
ennitungl / (þars gingu
fyr vinjeyjar víðri
vallrauf) / fjogur haufuð.

(The oxen carried—and eight brow moons—as they went before the wide
patch of the grassy island—four heads.)

Some stanzas apparently contain lines with two syntactic boundaries, yet others
display a feature known from Latin poetry and rhetoric, namely tmesis. Consider
the following examples:

> Hfr III, 21:5-8 væri oss / (þótt ærir
> elds þeim svikum beldi)
> heilalíkn / ef / (hauka
> háklifs) / jǫfurr lifði;

(It would be to us [me]—although the senders of the fire committed that
treason—a soothing comfort—if—of the hawks' high cliff—the king were
alive, i.e., it would be a soothing comfort to me if the king were alive,
although the senders of the fire of the hawks' high cliff [the senders of the
fire of the arm: the senders of gold] committed that treason.)

> Haustl 10:3-4 þá vas Ið—með jǫtnum
> —Unnr nýkomin sunnan.

(Then had *Ið*—among the giants—*unnr* newly come from the south.)

In Hallfreðr's *helmingr* the third line seems to contain the elements of three
different sentences; in the couplet from "Haustlǫng," the elements of the name of
the goddess *Ið-unnr* have been separated by a prepositional phrase. The existence
of syntactically tripartite lines and tmesis has been the topic of heated debate: some
scholars believed that *dróttkvætt* lines contained both tmesis and tripartite
structures (Finnur Jónsson 1924, 1933; Reichardt 1928:151-214, 1930:199-258,
1962, 1969), some reluctantly admitted their existence but claimed that such
structures were extremely rare (E. A. Kock, *Notationes norrœnæ* § 303; Kuhn
1929:200-201, 1983:161, 169-70), and some rejected them altogether (Genzmer
1928).[39]

These divergent views are reflected in the criteria for textual emendations and
interpretation in the two main editions/translations of skaldic poetry, E. A. Kock
(1923-44, 1946-49) and Finnur Jónsson (1912-15). Finnur (1929:148) claimed that
skaldic word order was almost without rules and that a skaldic poem would not
necessarily have been understood during recitation. Kock maintained that the word
order of skaldic poetry was freer than that of eddic poetry, but that the norms were
not very different. He formulated the following principle for his textual
emendations (E. A. Kock 1923:69, *Notationes norrœnæ* § 131)[40]: "[S]ök att, under
största möjliga anpassning till handskrifternas vittnesbörd å ena sidan, till annat

känt fornjermanskt språkmaterial å andra sidan, åstadkomma en jämförelsevis enkel, även vid muntligt föredrag begriplig text!" Hans Kuhn (1934) took issue with the editorial principles of both Finnur Jónsson and E. A. Kock. Kuhn accused Finnur of disregarding the text transmitted in the manuscripts and pointed out that even the diplomatic edition (*Skj* I-IIA) contained numerous mistakes and mistranscriptions (1934:411-12). Kuhn's criticism of Kock's edition was even more devastating. He argued that there is no such thing as a universal, simple, natural, and immediately understandable order of words; it must be empirically determined in each individual case (1934:414). According to Kuhn, the word order in skaldic poetry is closely related to the structure of each stanza and follows its own norms; the main issue is, in his opinion, to discover the rules behind that order of words (1934:414-15).

It is clear that at least the later skalds were aware that clause arrangement could be consciously used as an artistic device. In "Háttatal," a clavis metrica from around 1220, Snorri Sturluson based some of his metrical variants (*hættir*) on different sentence patterns, and he distinguished among the following structures:[41]

(1) Sixteen-Clause Pattern (*sextánmælt*). Each line contains two independent clauses, and sixteen sentences make up one stanza (Ht 9:1-4; *SnE* I:614; the orthography in this and the following half-stanzas has been normalized):

Ht 9:1-4   vex íðn / vellir roðna /
                     verpr lind / þrimu snerpir /
                     fæsk gagn / fylkir eignask /
                     falr hitnar / sezk vitnir.

(2) Eighth-Clause Pattern (*áttmælt*). Each line contains one clause, and the sentence boundary coincides with the metrical caesura (Ht 10:1-4; *SnE* I:614):

Ht 10:1-4   jǫrð verr siklingr sverðum /
                     sundr rjúfa spjǫr undir /
                     lind skerr í styr steinda /
                     støkkr hauss af bol lausum.

(3) Pattern with Insertion (*stælt*). Lines 1 and 4 belong together syntactically, while lines 2-3 form an independent statement (Ht 12:1-4; *SnE* I:616):

Ht 12:1-4   Hákon veldr ok hǫldum
                     (harðráðum guð jarðar
                     tyggja lér með tíri)
                     teitr þjóðkonungs heiti.

(4) Pattern with Sequential Insertion (*hjástælt*). Positions 2-6 in line 4 are occupied by an independent clause whose content deals with ancient lore (Ht 13:1-4; *SnE* I:618):

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Ht 13:1-4   manndýrðir fá mærðar
                          mæt ǫld fira gæti
                          lýtr auðgjafa ítrum
                          ǫll / (stóð sær of fjǫllum).

</div>

(5) Pattern with Embedded Explanation (*tilsagt*). Positions 1-4 in even lines contain an explanatory inserted clause (Ht 25:1-4; *SnE* I:634):

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Ht 25:1-4   rǫst gefr ǫðlingr jastar
                          (ǫl virðik svá) / firðum
                          þǫgn fellir brim bragna
                          (bjórr forn es þat) / horna.

</div>

The corpus of extant *dróttkvætt* poetry shows examples of all these variants, but they are nowhere as systematically carried through as in Snorri's *hættir*. It seems therefore that Snorri stylized certain peculiarities and made them normative, and his syntactic patterns must not be taken as prescriptive but rather as descriptive of phrasal arrangements that occasionally occur in *dróttkvætt* stanzas. The question whether such patterns were used consciously to achieve certain artistic effects must be left open, but recent investigations into the use of *hjástælt* indicate that they could have been.[42]

Konstantin Reichardt was the first modern scholar to attempt systematically to establish fixed patterns in the apparently arbitrary distribution of phrases and clauses in skaldic poetry (Reichardt 1928). By examining the clause arrangements in *dróttkvætt* and *halfhnept* stanzas from the ninth and tenth centuries, he was able to discern the following patterns:[43]

(A) One-Clause Pattern. The whole *helmingr* consists of one clause:

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Haustl 5:1-4   fljótt bað foldar dróttinn
                          Fárbauta mǫg Váru
                          þekkiligr með þegnum
                          Þryms seilar hval deila.

</div>

(B) Sequence Pattern. A clause is added to the preceding clause; the sentence boundaries may or may not coincide with the metrical caesura:

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Korm I, 5   hróðr gerik of mǫg mæran
                          meir Hákonar fleira /
                          Haptsœnis geldk hánum
                          heið / sitr Þórr í reiðu.

</div>

(C) Frame Pattern. A clause is embedded in another clause:

Gldr 4:5-8 ok allsnœfrir jǫfrar
orðalaust at morði /
(endisk rauðra randa
rǫdd) / dynskotum kvǫddusk.

(D) Interlace Pattern. Parts of interrupted clauses are embedded in each other:

Vell 29:1-4 þrymr varð logs / (þars lǫgðu
leikmiðjungar) / Þriðja /
arngreddir varð / (odda) /
andvígr / (saman randir).

Patterns B-D could be combined in various ways: BD, CD, and BCD (1928:108-17; cf. D. Edwards 1983:128, "mixed patterns"). In his discussion of these patterns, Reichardt made several interesting observations on the nature of clause arrangement and syntax in *dróttkvætt*. A *helmingr* consisting of one clause only, Reichardt claimed, would also contain the longest and most elaborate *kenningar* and the most complex word order (1928:72):

Vell 37:5-8 *þess[1] ríðr fúrs[1] með fjórum*
folkleikr Heðins reikar[2]
logskundaðar lindar[1]
lofkenndr[2] himins endum.

In half-stanzas containing more than two intercalated sentences, a third sentence could not be introduced before one of the former was concluded (a[1]b[1]a[2]c[1]; Reichardt 1928:77; a-c designate the interrupted sentences):

Eg lv 20:5-8 Gunnhildi ák gjalda[a]
(greypts hennar skap)[b] / þenna[a]
(ungr gatk ok læ launat)[c]
landrekstr[a] / (bili grandat)[c].

Reichardt (1928:123-150) also discovered that the skalds showed a marked preference for either placing disrupted elements belonging to the same clause below each other in the *dróttkvætt* half-stanza or connecting syntactic units across the metrical caesura by means of alliteration. Consider the following examples:

Vell 18:1-4   *engi* varð á jǫrðu
               ættum góðr nema Fróði
               Gætinjǫrðr / (sás gerði)
               geirbríkar / (frið slíkan);

Hfr III, 28:5-8   bíða munk / (þess's *breiðan*
                   barðmána vann skarðan)
                   margaukanda mækis
                   móts aldrigi bótir.

Reichardt called these devices "vertical placement" (*Tiefstellung*) and "enjambment" (*Hakenstil*) respectively, and he claimed that both were consciously used by the skalds to emphasize syntactic coherence and to facilitate the comprehension of a stanza during recitation (Reichardt 1928:123, 131, 139-41). He concluded that the clause arrangement of skaldic poetry was not at all unsystematic; rather, it was subject to certain rules that must have been learned by the poet and recognized by the audience (Reichardt 1928:252).

Reichardt's clause arrangements were further investigated by Diana Edwards, who maintained that the skalds' delight in syntactic intricacies was less general and less extreme than might have been supposed, and that the simpler patterns were favored in the *lausavísur* to a still more marked degree than in encomiastic poetry (D. Edwards 1983:144-45).

Reichardt's observations about vertical placement in *dróttkvætt* stanzas were later attacked by Hans Kuhn, who pointed out that, of the 167 stanzas discussed by Reichardt, only 68 (41 percent) contained vertical placement, hence he regarded such occurrences as unintentional (Kuhn 1929:196). Wolfgang Mohr, however, disagreed with Kuhn's criticism and maintained that, if one accounts for vertical placement of disrupted syntactic units, not only of elements belonging to different clauses (on which Kuhn's 41 percent were based), the number of examples could easily be doubled (Mohr 1933:13). Mohr concluded therefore, with Reichardt, that vertical placement must have been used as a structural device in *dróttkvætt* poetry. Perhaps because of Kuhn's criticism, vertical placement has never been accepted as a constitutive element in skaldic composition, and Reichardt's results have been largely ignored by later scholars.[44]

Since the 1930s, Hans Kuhn has dominated the field of skaldic scholarship, and his numerous articles and magnum opus, *Das Dróttkvætt* (1983), shed important light on the structure of *dróttkvætt* poetry.[45] Kuhn maintained that there is a close connection between metrics and syntax. According to him, all *dróttkvætt* lines are divided by a syntactic caesura, and, using Sievers's five-type system as his theoretical framework, he isolated recurring syntactic units that under the same metrical conditions would fill the two lifts on one side of these caesuras. The result was the following system of syntactic fillers (*Füllungstypen*), arranged according

to Sievers with subgroups determined by the placement of internal rhyme, alliteration, and long and short lifts. The following table is adapted from Kuhn 1983:92-97; in Kuhn's notation, $\acute{-}$ denotes a lift; $\grave{-}$ secondary stress; × a dip; ″ a lift with alliteration; ⚬̥ a syllable carrying internal rhyme, and a vertical line | marks the syntactic caesura:

	Odd Lines		*Even Lines*
Type A	$\acute{-} × \acute{-} × \acute{-} ×$	Type IIA (A1 and A2)	$″ × \acute{-} × \acute{-} ×$
A1	$\frac{″}{⚬} × \mid \frac{″}{⚬} × \frac{\prime}{⚬} × ;$ $\frac{″}{⚬} \mid × \frac{″}{⚬} × \frac{\prime}{⚬} ×$	IIA1	$\frac{″}{⚬} \mid × \acute{-} × \frac{\prime}{⚬} ×;$ $\frac{″}{⚬} × \mid \acute{-} × \frac{\prime}{⚬} ×;$ $\frac{″}{⚬} × \acute{-} \mid × \frac{\prime}{⚬} ×$
Rdr 9:3	malma | mætum hilmi	Rdr 3:4	draum | í sverða flaumi
Haustl 4:3	hlaut | af helgum skutli	Rdr 3:8	harma | Erps of barmar
		Rdr 15:4	endi-seiðs | of kenndi
A2[1]	$\frac{″}{⚬} × \acute{-} \mid × \frac{″}{⚬} ×$	IIA2	$″ × \frac{\prime}{⚬} \mid × \frac{\prime}{⚬} ×$
Gldr 6:1	grennir þrǫng | at gunni	Haustl 15:2	endi-lág | fyr mági
A2[2]	$″ × \frac{\prime}{⚬} \mid × \frac{″}{⚬} ×$		
Rdr 6:7	enni-hǫgg | ok eggiar		
A2k[1]	$\frac{″}{⚬} \grave{-} \acute{-} × \mid \frac{″}{⚬} ×$	IIA2k = IID1	
Eil III, 1:1	set-bergs kveða | sitia		
A2k[2]	$″ \grave{\frac{-}{⚬}} \acute{-} × \mid \frac{″}{⚬} ×$		
Gldr 7:3	svart-skyggð bitu | seggi		
A3[1]	$\frac{\prime}{⚬} × \frac{″}{-} \mid × \frac{″}{⚬} ×;$ $\frac{\prime}{⚬} × \frac{″}{-} × \mid \frac{″}{⚬} ×$		
Gldr 5:1	háði gramr | þar's gnúðu		
Rdr 6:1	miǫk lét stála | støkkvir		
A3[2]	$\acute{-} × \frac{″}{⚬} \mid × \frac{″}{⚬} ×;$ $\acute{-} × \frac{″}{⚬} × \mid \frac{″}{⚬} ×$		
Haustl 15:1	knáttu ǫll | en Ullar		
Haustl 5:5	en af breiðu | bióði		

Type B   × ″×́ ´́ | ″ ×

B   × ″̥ × ´́ | ″̥ ×
Haustl 2:3   í gemlis ham | gǫmlum

B¹   ×̥ ″ × ´́ | ″̥ ×
Sigv lv 2:1   hlýð mínum brag | meiðir

Type C   × ″ ´̆ × | ´ ×

Cl¹   × ″̥ ´́ × | ″̥ ×
Eg lv 26:7   fyr róg-naðra | regni

Cl²   × ″ ´̥ × | ″̥ ×
Rdr 6:5   ok blá-serkiar | birkis

Ck¹   × ″̥ ´̆ × | ″̥ ×
Rdr 8:3   til fár-huga | fœra

Ck²   × ″ ´̥ × | ″̥ ×
Haustl 1:7   á hrein-gǫru | hlýri

Ck³   ×̥ ″ ´̆ × | ″̥ ×
Arn V, 24:3   brestr erfiði | Austra

Type D   ″ ´ ´̆ × | ″ ×

Dl¹	″̥ ´ ´̆ × | ″̥ ×	IID1l¹	″̥ ´ ´̆ × | ´̥ ×; ″̥ | ´ ´̆ × ″̥ ×
Haustl 18:3	bǫl-verðungar | Belia	Rdr 2:4 / Rdr 13:4	mǫgr Sigvarðar | Hǫgna / rauk | Danmarkar auka
Dl²	″ ´̥ ´̆ × | ″̥ ×	IID1l²	″ ´̥ ´̆ × | ´̥ ×
Rdr 11:3	feng-eyðandi | flióða	Rdr 12:2	sal-penningi | kenna
Dk¹	″̥ ´ ´̆ × | ″̥ ×	IID1k¹	″̥ ´ ´̆ × | ´̥ ×; ″̥ | ´ ´̆ × ´̥ ×; ″̥ ´ ´̆ × ″̥ ×
Hfr I, 3:3	barr-haddaða | byriar	Haustl 16:4 / Rdr 8:8 / Haustl 4:6	brann upp-himinn manna / baug | ǫr-lygis draugi / víg-frekr | ofan sígask

Dk²	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\,\smile\times\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$	IID1k²	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\,\smile\times\mid\overset{\prime}{\circ}\times;$
			$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\mid\,\smile\times\overset{\prime}{\circ}\times$
Eyv lv 5:7	goll-hiǫltuðum l galtar	Bragi II, 4:4	ó-niðraðan l þriðia
		Rdr 13:8	vall-rauf l fiǫgur haufuð
		IID4¹	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times;$
			$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\mid\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times$
		Rdr 1:4	þjófs ilia-blað l leyfa
		Tindr I, 5:4	geirs l tírar-fǫr meiri
		IID4²	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times$
		Haustl 20:4	ryðs hœli-bǫl l gœli
Type E	$\overset{\prime\prime}{}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{}\times$		
E¹	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$	IIE1	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times;$
			$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\mid\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times;$
			$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\mid\times\,\acute{}\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times$
Haustl 2:1	segiǫndum fló l sagna	Haustl 11:6	vreiðr mælti svá l leiðir
		Haustl 17:4	íss l vildu svá dísir
		Haustl 8:2	fang-sæll l of veg langan
E²	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$	IIE2	$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\,\acute{}\mid\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times;$
			$\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\mid\times\,\acute{}\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times$
Haustl 18:1	fiǫr-spillir lét l falla	Rdr 6:4	Fogl-hildar mun l vildu
		Haustl 1:4	radd-kleif l at Þór-leifi.
Type X	$\overset{\prime\prime}{}$ in syllables 4 and 5		
XB	$\times\,\acute{}\overset{}{\circ}\times\overset{\prime\prime}{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$		
Gldr 2:5	áðr út á mar l mœtir		
XE¹	$\overset{\prime}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\overset{\prime\prime}{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$		
Gldr 5:3	rauð fnýsti ben l blóði		
XE²	$\overset{\acute{}}{\circ}\,\acute{}\times\overset{\prime\prime}{}\mid\overset{\prime\prime}{\circ}\times$		
Hgóði 1:1	vel launa mér l mínir.		

On the basis of his observations on the structure of skaldic (and Germanic alliterative) poetry, Kuhn formulated the following rules and laws:

(1) "The Law of Sentence Particles" (*Satzpartikelgesetz* [Kuhn 1933:8, 1983:199-202]): sentence particles (i.e., all unstressed or weakly stressed words that are not syntactically bound but function as syntactically independent constituents) stand in the first dip of the sentence, proclitically to either the first or the second stressed word.[46]

(2) "The Law of Sentence Introduction" (*Satzspitzengesetz* [Kuhn 1933:43, 1983:199-202]): sentence particles must stand in anacrusis.

(3) "The Rule of Syntactic Coherence" (Kuhn 1983:67, 132): in odd lines, the nonalliterating lift falling between two alliterating lifts belongs syntactically to the first lift.[47]

(4) "The Law of the Caesura" (*Zäsurgesetz* [Kuhn 1929:199, 1969a:215-21, 1983:89-90, 132-35): all *dróttkvætt* lines are divided by a syntactic caesura, which in odd lines falls between the alliterating staves, in even lines between the syllables with internal rhyme.

The validity of these laws and rules has been challenged on occasion, and in his later work Kuhn himself to some extent modified certain of his earlier statements.[48] He admitted that the law of sentence particles was violated in *dróttkvætt* poetry as early as the ninth century and lost its power in the tenth (Kuhn 1983:201-2). He also conceded that, in even lines with only one alliterating stave, the placement (and presence) of the caesura was difficult to ascertain, which accounts for his problems in differentiating between Types A2k and D, E and D4, for example (Kuhn 1983:94-96, 160-61). Despite the fact that Kuhn's laws and rules demonstrably contain inherent contradictions and weaknesses, however, most scholars accept and reproduce them in their works on skaldic poetry, and, to quote Kuhn himself, "ich kenne aus ihnen [den letzten 50 Jahren] keine Arbeit, die mich in einem der wichtigeren Teilgebiete überholte oder aus der Bahn warf" (Kuhn 1983:18).[49]

Composition, Comprehension, and Recitation of Dróttkvætt *Poetry*

Very little is known about the process involved in the composition of skaldic poetry, and the scant information there is must be gleaned from the poems themselves and the surrounding prose. As scholars have repeatedly pointed out, there is great uncertainty concerning the date of and provenance of the poetry in the sagas and the relations between verse and prose (see the summary by Frank 1985:172-74). We cannot ascertain to what extent the sagas give an accurate portrayal of the conditions under which skaldic poetry was composed and

performed, but, because this poetic tradition was alive in thirteenth-century Iceland when most of the sagas were recorded, it stands to reason that the descriptions relating to skaldic poetry, although stereotyped and perhaps idealized, could not have deviated too much from thirteenth-century reality.

Most of the longer skaldic poems appear to have been premeditated. Egill Skalla-Grímsson allegedly composed his "Hǫfuðlausn" in one night (*ÍF* 2:182-83), and Einarr skálaglamm claimed to have made a praise poem about Earl Hákon while the other retainers were asleep (Eskál IV, 1). Similar saga episodes also indicate that longer praise poems were believed to have been composed in the course of one night (e.g., *ÍF* 2:272, 35:125), but others show that at least the longer poems and *drápur* were prepared in advance over a longer period of time before they were recited before a chieftain or a king.[50] The saga descriptions of the procedure according to which such premeditated encomiastic poems were brought to court and performed is very stereotyped: the Icelandic skald arrives at the court of a foreign (mostly Norwegian) king or chieftain, introduces himself, says that he has composed a panegyric in honor of the dignitary in question, and asks for permission to recite his poem (Koller 1939:24-26). In some cases the poem is performed by person other than the composer, as is shown by an episode involving the Icelander Steinn Skaptason at the court of Óláfr Haraldsson (*Hkr* 321): "Skapti, faðir hans, hafði ort drápu um Óláf konung ok hafði kent Steini; var svá ætlat, at hann skyldi fœra kvæðit konungi" (His father, Skapti, had composed a *drápa* about King Óláfr and taught it to Steinn; he was to perform the poem for the king).[51] However, it appears that some single stanzas were composed on the spur of the moment, providing a spontaneous comment on the situation or functioning as a response to a challenge issued to the skald. In *Orkneyinga saga*, for example, the skald Oddi litli receives the following challenge from Earl Rǫgnvaldr (*ÍF* 34:202): "'Gerðu vísu um athǫfn þess manns, er þar er á tjaldinu, ok haf eigi síðarr lokit þinni vísu en ek minni. Haf ok engi þau orð í þinni vísu, er ek hef í minni vísu'" ('Make a stanza about the doings of the man depicted there on the tapestry, and you must finish your stanza no later than I finish mine. Also, your stanza must contain none of those words that I have in mine').[52] In another example, Sigvatr Þórðarson is characterized as follows (*Hkr* 351): "Sigvatr var ekki hraðmæltr maðr í sundrlausum orðum, en skáldskapr var honum svá tiltœkr, at hann kvað af tungu fram, svá sem hann mælti annat mál" (Sigvatr was not a quick-spoken man when it came to prose, but poetry was so easy for him that he spoke in verse as readily as if it were ordinary speech). This last example is especially illuminating, not only because it reflects the perceived difference between prose speech (*sundrlaus orð* 'unbound or separate words') and poetry (*samfǫst orð* 'bound or consecutive words'; i.e., *Flat* II: 263), but also because it shows that, although the sagas abound in extemporaneous poems, producing a stanza "as readily as if it were ordinary speech" was considered a special feat.

There is evidence that even the preliterate skalds used a technical vocabulary when discussing their art. *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar* contains an episode in which two skalds, Egill and Einarr skálaglamm, meet at the legal assembly and proceed to entertain themselves by talking about poetry, because "þótti hvárumtveggja þær rœður skemmtiligar" (that was a topic they both found enjoyable; *ÍF* 2:268). The saga reveals nothing about the nature of the vocabulary Egill and Einarr used on that occasion, but another scene from *Sneglu-Halla þáttr* is more informative in that respect. In a *lausavísa*, Sneglu-Halli boasts to his patron, King Haraldr Sigurðarson of Norway, of having composed a poem in honor of another chieftain which contained numerous violations of the norms of correct *dróttkvætt*. Consider the following stanza (*ÍF* 9:292-93; *Skj* IA 389-90):

SnH lv 7   Ortak eina
             of jarl þulu
             verðrat drápa
             með Dǫnum verri;
             fǫll eru fjórtán
             ok fǫng tíu;
             opits ok ǫndvert
             ǫfugt stígandi;
             svá skal yrkja
             sás illa kann.

(I made a ditty about an earl, no *drápa* could be worse among the Danes; it had fourteen "fǫll" and ten "fǫng"; it was open and reversed, moving awkwardly; thus he shall compose who is poorly skilled.)

The terms "open" and "reversed" most likely referred to syntactic incompletion or violation of the rules of word order,[53] whereas the ten "fǫng" (catches) and the fourteen "fǫll" (falls, dips) probably denoted an uneven distribution of metrically marked and unmarked syllables (Gade 1991), and "ǫfugt stígandi" the phonetic realization during recitation ('moving or rising awkwardly,' i.e., with reference to the former two entities). The phrase "ecki iafnhátt" (not equally high) with which Haraldr harðráði describes Þjóðólfr's defective *hendingar* ("grǫm : skǫmm," *Morkinskinna* 102; cf. above), also indicates that the skalds were acutely aware of the acoustic aspects of recitation and that they perceived the phonetic product as something concrete, as an entity with physical characteristics that could move up and down according to preestablished patterns (see also Kreutzer 1977:171, and the discussion in Chap. 8).

The question of how the intricate *dróttkvætt* poems were understood by the audience is intimately connected with the problems of skaldic word order (see the contrasting views of Finnur Jónsson and E. A. Kock, above). The literary evidence

is inconclusive. Certain saga episodes involving the recitation of skaldic verse indicate that the poems were not immediately understood by the audience: a king who received a panegyric in his honor, for example, often asked his other skalds whether the poem was well composed (*ÍF* 3:80; 9:290; see Kuhn 1983:250). Other episodes describe how people learned a poem by heart (*nema vísuna*) in order to be able to reproduce it on a later occasion (*ÍF* 2:183; 3:104, 291-92; 7:151, 205; 9:228; 34:227; *Hkr* 389). There is evidence that poems were interpreted only after they had been memorized. In *Gísla saga Súrssonar*, Gísli composes a poem in which he boasts about having killed the husband of his sister Þórdís and proceeds to recite it in her presence (*Gísl* 29-30). According to the saga, Þórdís memorizes the poem at once ("nam þegar vísuna"), goes home, and unravels the meaning ("hefir ráðit vísuna"), with dire consequences for Gísli. *Grettis saga* also contains a reference to the interpretation of poetry (*ÍF* 7:52): "'Kveða má svá, at fegri sé vísan, ef grafin er, þótt fyrst sé eigi allfǫgr'" ('You must compose it in such a way that the stanza is better if it is more closely examined, though at first it does not appear to be very good').

Several scholars have claimed that only a sophisticated audience schooled in the intricacies of skaldic diction would have been able to grasp the meaning of a *dróttkvætt* stanza (Konráð Gíslason 1872:314; Finnur Jónsson 1929:131-32; Lindow 1975:322; Kabell 1978:271-72), while others maintain that skaldic poems must have been easily understood by a medieval listener (notably E. A. Kock; Reichardt 1928:252; Genzmer 1930; Wood 1952:61). Kuhn argued that *dróttkvætt* poems were not meant to be understood during the first recitation; rather, they were to be memorized and then deciphered (Kuhn 1929:193; see also Heusler 1941:23). In the course of the centuries, to be sure, *dróttkvætt* poetry must have become increasingly obscure to the medieval audience: phonetic changes that upset the syllabic patterns and lack of knowledge about the mythological events behind the imagery of the *kenningar* and of the archaic poetic vocabulary never used in prose language must have contributed to that obscurity (see the discussion in Chap. 8). Yet it is difficult to believe that a poetic tradition could survive for five centuries if it were not comprehensible to the audience (see Frank 1978:28, 1985:183-84), and it is likely that there existed certain norms or patterns of composition and recitation, familiar to the listener as well as to the poet, which would have been anticipated and recognized by the audience and which would have facilitated the understanding of *dróttkvætt* poetry.[54]

The sagas contain abundant references to performances of skaldic poetry but very little information about the actual process of recitation. The verbs that are used to denote skaldic recitation are *verba dicendi* (*kveða* 'to say, speak, recite, compose'; *mæla* 'to speak'; *segja* 'to say, tell, narrate,' with the emphasis on the communicative aspects rather than on the actual utterance) and verbs that describe the actual process of presentation (e.g., *bera framm*, *færa [framm]* 'deliver,' *flytja framm* 'set in motion, deliver'; see Kreutzer 1977:148-71). The adverbs modifying

these verbs usually refer to the loudness or the quality of the performance (*kveða hátt* 'recite loudly'; *vel kveðit* 'recited well / correctly'; *bera framm / flytja framm skǫruliga* 'deliver in a commendable manner'). These expressions accord well with the poetic terms discussed above, and confirm the image of a skaldic stanza as a physical entity that the poet "set in motion" and "brought to a close."

It is generally agreed that the mode of recitation must have facilitated the understanding of *dróttkvætt* poems. Some suggest that skaldic poetry was sung or recited to musical accompaniment (Olafsen 1786:139; Stefán Einarsson 1963:27; Hofmann 1963:83-121; Hofmann and Jammers 1965; De Geer 1985:216-19, Kristján Árnason 1991:172) or that *dróttkvætt* stanzas were performed by two singers, in the manner of alternate singing (Steblin-Kamenskij 1946). However, there is no evidence that skaldic poetry, or eddic poetry for that matter, was sung or performed with music. Musical instruments are never referred to in connection with poetic recitation (Frank 1978:28; Kuhn 1983:245; De Geer 1985:220-27), and the verbs that introduce skaldic stanzas in the sagas, *kveða*, *mæla*, *segja*, are all bona fide *verba dicendi*. As such they are strictly separated from *syngja* 'to sing,' which is used exclusively to describe the performance of liturgic rituals or, in earlier skaldic poems, the noises of weapons or animals (Kreutzer 1977:60-62, 153-60).[55] Although *kveða*, the verb most frequently connected with Norse poetic performance, later came to denote the musical recitation of *rímur* in Iceland and folk songs in Norway (*kvede*), this appears to be a secondary development (Kuhn 1983:244-45). Most scholars have therefore rejected the idea of a musical performance of skaldic poetry (Finnur Jónsson 1920:410; Sigurður Nordal 1931-32:145; Heusler 1941:112; Einar Ól. Sveinsson 1962:99; Lönnroth 1971:5; Kreutzer 1977:160; Kabell 1978:270; Kuhn 1983:244-46), but agree that the recitation of *dróttkvætt* stanzas must have differed from that of prose (cf. *samfǫst orð* vs. *sundrlaus orð*, above). According to Kuhn (1983:245), *dróttkvætt* poetry was characterized by emphatic recitation, with changes in intensity, pitch, and sonority; Kreutzer (1977:155) believed that the comprehension of such stanzas was facilitated by articulation, stress, loudness, phrasing, and perhaps also by modulation of pitch, as did Finnur Jónsson (1920:340), Jón Helgason (1953:22), Lie (1952:81), Einar Ól. Sveinsson (1962:99), and Hollander (1968:18). Some have speculated that parenthetic clauses could have been emphasized by special intonation, either by using a different pitch or a different vocal register (Reinskou 1924:71; Genzmer 1930:155; de Vries 1941:85; Jón Helgason 1953:105; Hollander 1965:639), and it has been suggested that additional acoustic devices or pauses (Hollander 1965:636, 639) or a system of pointing (Frank 1978:51) could have been used during the recitation of *dróttkvætt* poems and served as a guide for the audience.

Whether skaldic recitation proceeded according to an ideal norm, one that remained unchanged throughout the centuries and the different territories in which this art was practiced, is impossible to ascertain (see Kuhn 1983:245-46). The

phonetic changes that took place in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (desyllabification of final -*r*, diphthongization of *é*, etc.) would surely have upset the fine balance of the syllabic structure and might even have led to the final demise of *dróttkvætt* (Gade 1986b, and Chap. 8, below). However, a curious episode in *Vatnsdœla saga* seems to indicate that skaldic poetry, at least during a certain period, must have followed a fixed rhythmical/temporal pattern of recitation. In this episode, Þorsteinn Ingimundarson sends his shepherd to spy on a neighboring farm (*ÍF* 8:68):

> Þorsteinn hitti úti smalamann sinn ok mælti: 'Far þú í Áss ok drep á dyrr ok hygg at, hversu skjótt er til hurðar gengit, ok kveð meðan vísu...'. Sauðamaðr fór ok kom í Áss ok drap á dyrr, ok var eigi fyrr til gengit en hann hafði kveðit tólf vísur. ... Sauðamaðr fór aptr ok sagði Þorsteini, hvé margar vísur hann hafði kveðit. Þorsteinn kvað hann úti hafa staðit þá stund, at mart mátti at hafask inni á meðan.

> (Þorsteinn found his shepherd outside and said: 'Go to Áss and knock at the door, and pay attention to how fast they come to the door, and in the meantime you shall recite poetry...'. The shepherd went and came to Áss and knocked at the door, and nobody answered until he had recited twelve stanzas. ... The shepherd went back and told Þorsteinn how many stanzas he had recited. Þorsteinn said that he had stood outside sufficiently long for a lot to take place inside in the meantime.)

This episode, which stands alone in saga literature,[56] cannot of course be taken to prove that skaldic poetry was a commonly used device to tell the time in Norse society, but it does show that the recitation of such poems must have proceeded according to a rather fixed rhythm (there is no mention of slow or fast recitation). Furthermore, because it is difficult to imagine that the shepherd could have stood in front of the enemies' door singing or chanting his poems out loud, the verb *kveða* in this particular context must have referred to a silent recitation of the stanzas.

Based on the evidence provided by the poetic vocabulary and the saga prose recounting performances of skaldic poetry, we must conclude that neither singing nor musical accompaniment played a part in skaldic recitation. In one of the most recent contributions devoted to this controversy, De Geer (1985:219) concludes that "there seems to be no reason why skaldic stanzas should not have been sung, as long as 'singing' is not understood in a very narrow, 19th-century, sense." She further suggests that "a sung delivery in free rhythm, and also the recitation of a poem with melodic voice inflections" could have characterized skaldic recitation (ibid.). A similar view is held by Kristján Árnason (1991:172), who takes the occasional cohesive internal rhymes (internal rhymes crossing morphemic

boundaries) as evidence that skaldic poetry could have been chanted or sung in a special way, just as the later *rímur* were performed to certain distinctive tunes (*rímnastemmur*). However, it is not quite clear why cohesive rhymes should presuppose a sung rather than a spoken delivery, and as long as no connection can be established between the musical recitation of the *rímur* (whose *stemmur* are characterized by features that strongly resemble those of medieval ecclesiastic music) and that of early skaldic poetry, such speculations must at best remain tenuous.[57]

The declamation of *dróttkvætt* poetry at court was distinguished by its loudness (*kveða hátt*), and the poetic vocabulary shows that skalds must have been aware of such acoustic aspects as the syllabic quantity of the rhyming syllables, the flow of recitation, and the number of metrically marked and unmarked syllables in the *dróttkvætt* line. Whereas the singing or chanting of psalms could be described according to tempo (*Bisk* I:17: "Hann söng hvern dag þriðjung af pasaltara seint ok skynsamliga" [Every day he sang one-third of the Psalter slowly and wisely]), the adverbs *seint* (slowly) and *skjótt* (fast) are never used to characterize the recitation of skaldic poetry.[58] Rather, if the anecdote in *Vatnsdæla saga* can be granted any credibility, skaldic recitation seems to have followed rhythmical patterns of a more or less uniform tempo, which accords badly with the concept of "a sung delivery in free rhythm" (De Geer 1985:219). Because the conditions under which this type of poetry was produced are beyond reconstruction, it is impossible to ascertain to what extent different modulations of voice, accentuation, and pauses could have been used to delineate the syntax and facilitate the listeners' comprehension of the stanzas. The only corpus that can yield any information about these aspects is the *dróttkvætt* poems themselves, but as long as the structural principles underlying the *dróttkvætt* remain unclear, we can only speculate about the recitation, composition, comprehensibility, and origin of this poetic genre.

Concluding Remarks

Dróttkvætt poetry emerges as a fullblown poetic genre in ninth-century Scandinavia and fades from the scene just as suddenly at the end of the fourteenth century. The meter is distinguished formally from eddic alliterative poetry (*fornyrðislag*) and is characterized by a stylization of alliterating patterns (two alliterating staves in odd lines, the main stave fixed on the first syllable in even lines), syllable counting, internal rhymes, a fixed final disyllabic cadence, and stanzaic structure (eight lines that fall into two separate *helmingar*). Scholars have attempted to trace the models of some of these features (syllable counting, rhyme, and the cadence) in Old Irish syllabic poetry, but we have seen that the realization of those features is quite different in the two traditions. Hence the relations between Old Irish and Old Norse skaldic poetry, with the possible exception of

runhent, remain tenuous, and a closer examination of the structure of *dróttkvætt* compared to that of eddic *fornyrðislag* may shed new light on this controversy and allow us to answer the question of whether this skaldic meter could have developed within an indigenous Norse environment.

Perhaps as a result of the strict formal requirements, the word order in *dróttkvætt* stanzas can be convoluted. Scholars have debated to what extent this type of poetry would have been intelligible to the audience and whether the comprehensibility could have been facilitated by the mode of recitation. The information provided by the poetic vocabulary and the sagas is inconclusive, but it seems that skaldic poetry was neither sung nor recited to musical accompaniment; rather, the performance proceeded according to fixed rhythmical patterns, observing metrically marked and unmarked syllables and the quality of internal rhymes. Because the phonetic aspects of recitation cannot be retrieved, only a detailed analysis of these entities and their function in *dróttkvætt* lines can yield information on the relationship between structure, syntax, and general comprehensibility.

Several attempts have been made to retrieve the systems of clause arrangements (Reichardt 1928) and syntactic groups (Kuhn 1983) underlying the structure of this type of poetry. Kuhn was the first to explore the relations between meter and word order. He set up a number of rules and laws for the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines are still generally accepted by scholars, and attempts to take issue with Kuhn's results or to probe the implications of his findings have been few. The reason for this is clear: Kuhn tended to present his laws and rules as faits accomplis, although it is often very difficult to trace the line of reasoning that prompted their formulation. Futhermore, he worked within an established methodological framework, and questioning his results means questioning the validity of that very framework, a task most Old Norse scholars seem reluctant to take on.[59] However, any attempt to affirm or to contradict Kuhn's laws and to explain how his observations relate to the dynamics of *dróttkvætt* must necessarily explore the theoretical basis on which Kuhn built his work. In the following chapter, then, I will discuss in detail the constitutive elements of *dróttkvætt* lines (syllabic length, stress, alliteration) and show how Kuhn's system is insufficient when it comes to explaining the characteristics of *dróttkvætt*. I will also critically appraise the most recent scholarly contribution to the area of skaldic metrics, Kristján Árnason's 1991 book on the rhythm of *dróttkvætt* meter. I suggest a new system of graphic representation and use it in the subsequent chapters to reveal the systems of word order and syntax that served the purposes of composition and comprehension, to show how *dróttkvætt* meter could have developed from eddic *fornyrðislag*, and finally to trace the factors that could have led to the demise of *dróttkvætt* in the fourteenth century.

The Constitutive Features of *Dróttkvætt*

Syllabic Quantity and Mora Counting

   Dróttkvætt meter appears to have been not only syllable counting but also mora counting. In his "Háttatal," Snorri Sturluson counted alliteration, internal rhyme, syllabic length, and "hard or soft syllables" among the constitutive features of *dróttkvætt*. He writes (*SnE* I:594): "Stafasetníng greinir mál allt; en hljóðgrein er þat at hafa samstöfur lángar eða skammar, harðar eða linar, ok þat er setníng hljóðsgreina er vær köllum hendingar" (The placement of [alliterating] letters determines all [poetic] speech; and distinction of sound is to have syllables that are long or short, hard or soft, and the norm of distinction of sound is that which we call internal rhymes [*hendingar*]). As I have shown elsewhere (Gade, n.d.), Snorri's "hard or soft" syllables most likely denoted accentuation (see also Boer 1927:266 n.2; Finnur Jónsson 1929:234), and his "long or short syllables" must have referred to an interchange between long and short syllables fundamental to the structure of *dróttkvætt*.

   We have seen that the cadence (positions 5-6) in a *dróttkvætt* line always consists of a long root syllable followed by a short enclitic inflectional or derivational ending ($\overline{\text{S}}\breve{\text{S}}$): words with a short stem, such as *hafa*, *taka*, can never occupy these positions. The same is true for words with a short stem followed by a long derivational suffix (*konungr*, *verǫld*) and hiatus words with a long vowel plus a short, enclitic ending with vocalic onset (*búa*, *níu*, *trúir*, *véum*), which in this respect are treated as short stems.[1] These short-stemmed disyllabic words and the hiatus words could, under certain circumstances, fill the position of a long monosyllable (resolution and neutralization, see the discussion in Chap. 3), but the sequence of three short syllables (*konungi*, *svaraða*) was prohibited in *dróttkvætt* lines (Kuhn 1939, 1983:38, 107, 109, 269; Gade 1991:370-73).

   Restrictions on syllabic length seem to have operated in other positions of the *dróttkvætt* line, too: in 1900, W. A. Craigie discovered that even lines with a disyllabic or trisyllabic compound or similar syntactic unit of the form $\overline{\text{SS}}(\breve{\text{S}})$ (Sievers's Types D4, E, and A2k) never tolerated a long-stemmed nomen in positions 3 and 4. Hence we find such lines as Rdr 5:2 *golfhǫlkvis* **sá** *fylkis*, Rdr 12:4 Ragnarr *ok* **fjǫl** *sagna*, and Rdr 13:8 *vallrauf* **fjogur** *haufuð*, but not †*golfhǫlhvis* **skál** *fylkis*, †Ragnarr *ok* **fjǫlð** *sagna*, and †*vallrauf* **fleiri** *haufuð*. Odd lines of these

types appear to have been even more sensitive in that respect, and only verbs, adverbs, and pronouns could occur in positions 4 and 3-4:

Haustl 4:5	Vingrǫgnir *lét* vagna
Eg lv 22:5	þar fellu *nú* þollar
Þmáhl 5:5	svá gørðum *vér* sverða
	†svá gerði *Týr* sverða
Eg I, 1:5	Aðalsteinn of *vann* annat
Vell 22:7	Ullr st**óð** *á því* allri
	†Ullr stóð á *sǫk* allri
Gldr 7:3	svartskyggð *bitu* seggi
	†svartskyggð *tváa* seggja.

In odd lines, the syllabic quantity of the monosyllabic verbs, pronouns, and adverbs in position 4 appears to be neutralized, that is, both long and short syllables are permitted, whereas the disyllabic verbs in Sievers's Type A2k (*svartskyggð bitu seggi*) must have a short root syllable. Craigie's observation about the restrictions on syllabic quantity in positions 3 and 4 in these types of *dróttkvætt* lines is known as Craigie's law, and it has neither been challenged nor fully explained.[2]

The fact that hiatus words of the type *búa*, *gróa* are treated like *hafa*, *taka* has caused much scholarly debate about the status of such syllables.[3] Sophus Bugge, who was the first to notice the phenomenon, and Eduard Sievers, who independently made the same observation, both believed that the long vowel in *búa*, *gróa* was shortened in hiatus (Bugge 1879:142; Sievers 1878:462; Bugge and Sievers 1891). Whereas Bugge tried to explain the alleged shortening phonetically (as the result of a strong secondary stress on the second syllable, as evidenced in Norwegian vowel harmony), Sievers regarded it as a metrical phenomenon: according to him, syllables of the type $\overline{V}V\neq$ were too short to carry a metrical lift (Bugge and Sievers 1891). In response to Bugge's initial observation, Grundtvig (1879:146-47), too, had attempted to furnish a phonological explanation of the alleged shortening. He argued that the long vowel contained a glide (*j-w*) that, in his opinion, was fully realized before a following vowel. Hence, Grundtvig maintained, *búa* and *gróa* become *buwa* and *growa*, that is, short syllables.

The so-called *Bugge-Sieversche Regel* about vowel shortening in hiatus later came under sharp attack from Hoffory (1889:91-92) and Beckman (1899:68-91), who both claimed that the root vowels in such words as *búa* and *gróa* were not shortened; rather, Old Norse had final-maximalistic syllabification (*bú-a*, *gró-a* = *haf-a*, *tak-a*) and not maximal onset syllabification (*bú-a*, *gró-a*, vs. *ha-fa*, *ta-ka*).[4] That syllabification was accepted by Pipping (1903a, 1903b:113, 1937), who formulated the following rules for the relation between syllabic division and mora counting (1903a:1; cf. Gade 1986a:96; Kristján Árnason 1991:113):

(1) A long sound has two morae.

(2) A short sound has one mora.

(3) Those syllables that have fewer than three morae are short, all other syllables are long.

(4) The morae of a syllable are counted from its vowel to (but not including) the vowel of the following syllable.

According to Pipping (1937:27), this syllabification has consequences for the distribution of *ja - ia* stems: the suffix *-ja* is tolerated as long as the distance from the onset of the root vowel to the onset of the suffix vowel (*-a*) does not exceed three morae (**sk | arj | a-, *t | alj | a-, *h | eyj | a-, fr | ýj | a-*). If the distance exceeds three morae, the suffix *-ia* occurs (**ku | āþ | i | a, *ð | ōm | i | a*). To put it differently: if the root syllable has fewer than three morae, the suffix is *-ja;* if it has three or more morae, the suffix is *-ia*. Pipping's syllabification has been generally accepted as valid for words in *dróttkvætt* lines.[5] Bimoric syllables (*vit, bú,* and *bú | a, vit | a*) were treated as short; syllables with three or more morae (*land, dæm | a, sókn*) were treated as long. Earlier *ja-* and *wa-* stems that had lost the glide were still treated as long in ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* poetry, and most critical editions reintroduce the old spellings, as in the following lines (see Kuhn 1937:59-60):

Rdr 13:7	fyr *vinjeyjar víðri
Rdr 2:4	mǫgr *Sigvarðar Hǫgna
Eg lv 15:3	í *niðjerfi Narfa
Gráf 8:2	*hrynjeld at þat brynju
Korm I, 2:4	hjarls *Sigvarði jarli.

In a recent publication, Kristján Árnason (1991:116, see also 1987) revives Grundtvig's phonetic explanation of vowel shortening in hiatus. According to Kristján (1991:116-17), the second mora of the long vowel was transferred to the second syllable, with an oral releasing function in that syllable. He writes (1991:116): "The preceding vowel, then, gets to keep its syllabicity, but its second mora is lost in forming an onset to the following syllable." This phonetic process may, in Kristján's view, be described as follows (ibid.): *bú.a > bu.ua > bu.wa*; *krí.a > kri.ia > kri.ja*. His main argument for assuming this syllabification appears to be that, whereas such forms as *búa* cannot carry a full ictus and in that respect behave like disyllabic short-stemmed words of the type *hafa*, "the corresponding monosyllabic *bú* is heavy and able to carry the ictus in an Eddic line" (1991:112). Furthermore, Kristján argues (1991:115), the first syllable in light syllables can rhyme (*geta þykkjask þess gotnar*), but the first syllables in words like *búa* cannot:

"Because of their special phonetic character they could only rhyme with themselves" (1991:118). As the following discussion shows, these arguments are based on very flimsy and often contradictory evidence, and none of them bears closer scrutiny.

First of all, the fact that the monosyllable *bú* could carry an ictus in eddic lines and was, in Kristján's definition, "heavy," would seem to have little bearing on the present issue because, he writes, "the most notable difference from the dróttkvætt is that an ictus [in eddic *fornyrðislag*] need not be filled by a heavy syllable" (1991:152). In *dróttkvætt* lines, he claims, an ictus could only be filled by a heavy syllable, and in such lines as Eg lv 8:3 barðisk *vel* sás varði and Gríss 1:1 *nú* þykkir mér nokkur, "the italicised 'light' monosyllables are followed by words that begin in consonants and thus become closed and heavy" (1991:169).[6] This comment shows that he indeed regards both *vel* and *nú* as "light" syllables, and we must infer then that, in Kristján's opinion, these monosyllables were treated similarly in *dróttkvætt* lines, a fact that serves to invalidate his initial premise.

According to Kristján (1991:112-18), both short-stemmed disyllabic words and hiatus words were excluded from the cadence and could not carry an ictus but, unlike the short-stemmed words, hiatus words could not carry a rhyme because of their special phonetic character.[7] While it is true that resolved, short-stemmed words in initial position could carry internal rhyme, such rhymes were generally avoided (in the corpus of ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* lines I counted sixteen examples in eighty-two lines). When they do occur, the rhymes include the segment $\breve{V}$+C, as in the following lines:

Gldr 5:8	hn*ig*u fjǫrvanir s*ig*ri
Eg I, 1:4	hǫ*fu*ðbaðmr þría jǫ*fra*
HolmgB 11:6	l*it*ak aldrigi b*it*ran
GSúrs 20:6	h*afa* bláfoldar ska*fla*
Þmáhl 4:2	þ*eg*i herr meðan s*eg*ja.

In comparison, resolution on hiatus words in initial position is much rarer (eight lines altogether) and, as Kristján correctly observes, rhymes on such words seem to be avoided.

In general, rhyme on a single vowel without the inclusion of the following consonant(s) is rare in *dróttkvætt* lines. In odd lines in which the rhyme included different vowels, it is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with internal vowel rhyme or no rhyme. Consider the following lines:

Kveld 1:1	n*ú* frák norðr í *ey*ju
EVald 3:1	sv*á* brá viðr at s*ý*jur
Korm lv 2:7	þr*á* muna oss of *æ*vi.

In even lines, with *aðalhending* and vowel identity, such rhymes are easier to identify, and they are restricted to certain stereotyped groups:

Gldr 1:4	*ey* vébrautar h*ey*ja
Eg lv 28:4	m*ey* ørlygi at h*ey*ja
HolmgB 2:8	Fr*ey*r einvígi h*ey*ja
Korm lv 25:6	geirþ*ey* of m*ey* h*ey*ja
Eg lv 8:8	*Ey*vindr of hljóp skr*ey*ja
Eyv lv 3:4	*Ey*vindar lið skr*ey*ju
Hfr III, 17:4	vígþ*ey* Heðins m*ey*jar
Korm lv 10:2	sefþ*ey*s at mér Fr*ey*ja
Hfr II, 4:8	geirþ*ey* á Skán*ey*ju
Hfr V, 24:4	fl*ey* meðal tv*eg*gja *ey*ja
Eyv lv 8:4	fr*æ* Hákonar *æ*vi
Þþyn 1:2	hr*æ*s es kømr at s*æ*vi
Vell 3:2	Hertýs of þat frýju
Hfr II, 1:6	hjǫrva gnýs ok skýjum.

All these *hendingar* comprise long vowels or diphthongs + glides rhyming with vowels or diphthongs in which the corresponding glides have been lost in final position (see Kuhn 1983:78), and there are no examples of the so-called empty rhymes involving such vowels as †*má valkastar báru*, †*sjau landrekar rauðir*, †*hjó þvít Kristi þjónum*.[8] However, even the earliest poetry contains examples of rhymes on syllables consisting of a long vowel that are carried over across the morphemic boundary: Haustl 5:7 *ó - svífrandi ása*, Þjóð IV, 2:4 *Gó - rǫðr of sjá stóran*, Gunnh 1:1 *Há - reið á bak báru* (cf. Chap. 1, p. 6; Kuhn 1983: 78; Kristján Árnason 1991: 102-3, 171) It seems therefore that the requirement for internal rhymes was that the vowel plus one or more of the following consonants must rhyme, unless the rhyming syllable consisted of the sequence vowel/diphthong plus a glide that had been lost in final position. If that is the case, such hiatus words as *búa*, *gróa* would be unsuitable as rhyming syllables, whereas other resolved short-stemmed words (*hǫfuð : jǫfra, hafa : skafla*) could rhyme, although they rarely do.[9] Hence the fact that internal rhymes on hiatus words are avoided cannot be taken as a proof of vowel shortening in hiatus; rather, these words could not carry internal rhyme because they could not accommodate the structure V+C.

As the present discussion has shown, the evidence for vowel shortening in hiatus is scant, and the treatment of nominal syllables in positions 3-4 and 4 in Sievers's Types E, A2k, and D4 described by Craigie's law, also opposes Kristján Árnason's maximal onset syllabification. In positions 3-4 of such lines (as well as with respect to the cadence and the rules of resolution, see below), hiatus words like *búa, véum* are treated like the short-stemmed disyllabics *hafa, taka*. Similarly, the monosyllabics *bú, vé* in position 4 behave like *haf, tak*. Kristján attempts to

explain this phenomenon by arguing that, whereas the maximal onset syllabification operated in a "pre-stress" situation, the restrictions on the syllabic structure of words in positions 3-4 and 4 as described by Craigie's law depended on the rules of sentence stress and were valid "after stress" (1991:123). He concludes therefore, "it is likely that syllabic coherence after stress was such that a maximal coda syllabification was appropriate under certain conditions" (ibid.). It is not quite clear what the term "after stress" entails, because, according to Kristján's scansions (1991:124), positions 3-4 and 4 in such lines are "weak" and hence, by his own definition, "unstressed" (cf. 1991:10-11). Nor is it clear why the "rules of sentence stress" should govern the syllabification in positions 3-4 and 4 and not influence the nature of stress/syllabification in other positions of the *dróttkvætt* line.[10] Under these circumstances it seems less complicated to assume that the syllabification in *dróttkvætt* lines indeed was final maximalistic, a short syllable (*bú-a*, *vit-a*) consisted of two morae, and a long syllable (*land-i*, *lát-a*, *Gǫndl-ar*) had three or more morae.[11]

We see from this discussion that the distribution of long and short syllables in *dróttkvætt* lines was subject to certain restrictions that can be summarized as follows:

(1) Bimoric disyllabic words (*vit-a*, *bú-a*, *kon-ungr*) could not occupy the cadence (positions 5-6).

(2) Such words could, under certain circumstances, fill the position of a long monosyllable (resolution, neutralization, see Chap. 3), but the sequence of three short syllables (*vit-andi*, *bú-andi*, *kon-ungi*) was prohibited.

(3) Only bimoric disyllabic words could occupy positions 3-4 in odd and even lines if the first two positions were filled by two long syllables (Craigie's law: Gldr 7:3 *svartskyggð* **bitu** *seggi*; Eg I, 1:4 *hǫfuð-baðmr* **þría** *jǫfra*; Gldr 9:4 *gnapstól* **Haraldr** *sólar*).

(4) No nomina consisting of three or more morae could occupy position 4 in even lines if the first two positions were occupied by two long syllables (Craigie's law: Haustl 13:6 *Finns* **iljabrú** *minni*; Rdr 5:2 *golfhǫlkvis* **sá** *fylkis*; Gldr 5:4 *bryngǫgl* í **dyn** *Skǫglar*). Likewise, no nomina consisting of three or more morae can occupy position 4 in odd lines if alliteration falls in position 4 (Hróm 1:1 *út* **heyrik** *svan* *sveita*; Eg lv 24:1 *kominn emk* á **jó** *Íva*). Inflectional *-r* and *-s* do not count as morae (Haustl 4:4 *hrafnásar* **vinr** *blása*; Vell 24:2 *víðfrægt en* **gramr** *síðan*).

(5) The restrictions on syllabic length in position 4 do not apply to nonnomina (verbs, adverbs, pronouns: Gráf 5:7 *ǫðlingi* **fekksk** *ungum*; Sindr 7:2 *opt sinn en* **þess** *minnumk*; Haustl 15:6 *hógreiðar* **framm** *drógu*; Hgóði 1:1 *vel launa* **mér** *mínir*); however, no particles, prepositions, or conjunctions can occur in that position if the first two positions are occupied by long syllables (†*sorgœran* **at** *fœra*; †*dagtála* **frá** *máli*; †*teinlautar* **ok** *Gauta*).

The Concept of Sentence Stress and Sievers's Five-Type System

The treatment of long and short syllables in *dróttkvætt* lines (the structure of cadence, the restrictions imposed in positions 3-4 and 4, resolution and neutralization, and the absence of the sequence S̆ S̆ S̆) shows that mora counting played a significant role in this type of poetry. This distinction seems, however, to have been maximally functional in disyllabic words only. Long-stemmed disyllabic words, regardless of word class, must occupy the cadence in odd and even lines:

Haustl 12:8	arnsúg faðir *Mǫrnar*	(noun)
Vell 12:1	hjalmgrápi vann *hilmir*	(noun)
Eg lv 20:4	brúðfang vega *langa*	(adjective)
Gldr 8:1	menfergir bar *margar*	(adjective)
Eg lv 37:2	armlinns konu *sinnar*	(pronoun)
TE 1:7	þegjandi sitr *þetta*	(pronoun)
Sindr 6:2	vígnestr saman *bresta*	(infinitive)
Haustl 18:1	fjǫrspillir lét *falla*	(infinitive)
Vell 23:8	Nóregr saman *fóru*	(finite verb)
Haustl 18:7	en Bergdana *bægði*	(finite verb)
Sindr 2:2	élrunnr mǫrum *sunnan*	(adverb)
Eg lv 11:1	valkǫstum hlóðk *vestan*	(adverb).

Conversely, only short-stemmed disyllabic words, regardless of class, occupy positions 3-4 in even lines if positions 1-2 are filled by two long syllables (Craigie's law):[12]

Haustl 6:4	okbjǫrn *faðir* Mǫrnar	(noun)
Þmáhl 5:8	lostigr *fáa* kosti	(adjective)
Hfr III, 23:6	margdýrr *koma* stýrir	(infinitive)
Hfr III, 4:4	brjótendr *skyti* spjótum	(finite verb)
Haustl 4:6	vígfrekr *ofan* sígask	(adverb)
Hfr V, 19:6	sofa karms *meðal* arma	(preposition).

In odd lines, only short-stemmed disyllabic verbs can occur in these positions:[13]

Gldr 7:3	svartskyggð *bitu* seggi
Eg lv 34:5	Arinbjǫrn *hefir* árnat
ÞHjalt 2:5	þat eitt *lifir* þeira.

The same difference between words belonging to different lexical categories can be observed among monosyllabics, too: in even lines, bimoric nomina (nouns, adjectives) can occur in position 4 (Craigie's law):[14]

Gráf 5:2	orðrakkr fyr *bý* norðan
Húsdr 10:4	Heimdallr at *mǫg* fallinn
Rdr 5:2	golfhǫlkvis *sá* fylkis
Glúmr I, 2:8	sverðbautinn *her* Gauti
Eg lv 23:6	sverfr eirar *vanr* þeiri.

In odd lines, bimoric nomina can occur in position 4 if they alliterate:

Hást 2:5	en tolf af *glað* Gylfa
Eg lv 24:1	kominn emk á *jó* Íva
Þmáhl 17:7	oss megni *goð* gagni
Eg lv 21:3	meir varðak *fé* forðum.

However, in both odd and even lines, verbs, adverbs, and pronouns can occupy that position regardless of phonetic length, but not prepositions, connectives, or particles:

Eg lv 8:8	Eyvindr of *hljóp* skreyja
Korm lv 28:8	slíðrbýðu *gekk* híði
Glúmr lv 1:3	folkrakkr of *vann* fylkir
Vell 32:1	valfǫllum *hlóð* vǫllu
HelgÓl 1:4	ítrtungur *hátt* sungu
Eg lv 13:2	hnúpgnípur *mér* drúpa
Þmál 5:5	svá gǫrðum *vér* sverða.

It seems then that, whereas the opposition long : short was functional in all types of disyllabic words, in monosyllabics that distinction apparently operated in the nominal lexical category only: verbal, adverbial, and pronominal fillers were not subject to the same restrictions as nomina when it comes to syllabic length. This difference in treatment is generally attributed to the rules of natural sentence stress (see Rieger 1876:18-34; Sievers 1893:41-46; Heusler 1956:105-15; Kuhn 1983:36-39; Kristján Árnason 1991:123). Because the concept of natural sentence stress is fundamental to the metrical framework that is used to describe the structural pecularities of *dróttkvætt* meter (Kuhn 1983:53), and because modern scholars tend to accept and adopt the rules of sentence stress uncritically and without questioning or referring to the principles that underlie the formulation of these rules (see Kuhn 1983:36-39; Kristján Árnason 1991:77-80), it is useful at this point to discuss their premises and to test their applicability with regard to the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines.

In 1876, Max Rieger examined the interplay between alliteration, lexico-grammatical categories, and word order in Old English and Old Saxon poetry. Rieger denied the existence of a specific poetic stress in Germanic alliterative

poetry: according to him, the poetic line reflected the normal prose sentence stress of the language (1876:18). The norms of natural sentence stress could, he argued, only be violated if a word received rhetorical emphasis or by metrical consideration, as in even lines when the alliterating stave is fixed on the first lift (1876:18-19). Rieger believed that a syllable that carried alliteration also received the strongest stress; hence an examination of the placement of the alliterating staves in odd half-lines and the syntactic relations between the alliterating and nonalliterating lifts must, in his opinion, yield information about the different levels of stress in a sentence (1876:19). The main results of Rieger's investigations can be summarized as follows (1876:19-32; cf. Sievers 1893:42-46; Heusler 1956:108-113):

(1) n+n: in a sequence of two nomina, the first must alliterate, or both can alliterate, but the second nomen cannot alliterate without the first (ń+n; ń+ń; but not n+ń). This also holds true for two words, regardless of lexico-grammatical category, that are joined together by connectives.

(2) n+n+n: in a sequence of three nomina, the placement of the second alliterating stave is determined by the syntactic relations between these nomina: if the second modifies the third, alliteration will fall in positions 1 and 2 (ń+ń+n); if the first modifies the second, the first and the third alliterate (ń+n+ń).

(3) v+n, n+v: in a sequence of verb + nomen or nomen + verb, the nomen must alliterate; a proclitic verb can also alliterate together with the nomen (v+ń; ń+v; v́+ń).

(4) n+n+v, v+n+n, n+v+n: if the first nomen modifies the second, the verb may, in the first position, carry the first stave and also the first lift without alliterating (v+ń+n; v́+ń+n). This is also the case when the verb stands in the third position and the first nomen modifies the second (ń+n+v; ń+n+v́). If the verb stands in the second position it can alliterate and carry a lift only when it is rhetorically stressed.

(5) ADV+v, v+ADV: prepositional adverbs in a verb-adverb collocation alliterate in proclitic position; in enclitic position they do not. Other adverbs do not normally alliterate in either position.

(6) Pronouns may or may not alliterate, and they can precede nomina without carrying alliteration.

Based on Rieger's observations, scholars have established the following hierarchy of natural sentence stress in the different lexico-grammatical categories (see also Sievers 1893:41-46; Heusler 1956:106-8; Kuhn 1933:5, 1983:113-24):

(1) Nomina (nouns, adjectives, infinitives, numerals, and the verbal participles I and II) are more heavily stressed than other word classes.

(2) The finite verb is less strongly stressed than a nomen. The verb of the main clause has less stress than that of a subordinate (bound) clause.

(3) Qualifying adverbs and pronouns are more strongly stressed than finite verbs and intensifying and temporal adverbs.

(4) Prepositions and connectives may stand in a lift, but rarely alliterate.

(5) Proclitic particles are always unstressed.

The hierarchy of sentence stress discovered by Rieger served as the basis for the formulation of Sievers's five-type system. Sievers attempted to prove through statistical classification of the occurring natural forms of stress that alliterative poetry, despite its variety of manifestation, proceeded according to a restricted series of individual forms, that is, his five types (Sievers 1893:8).[15] Sievers regarded rhythm as a product of intensity and duration and believed that the scheme of stress together with the quantity of foot and syllable determined the rhythmic forms (1893:23). Like Rieger, he believed that alliterative poetry reflected the sentence as it existed in prose, and the levels of stress could, in his opinion, therefore be established through a close examination of dynamic sentence and word stress (ibid.). With regard to quantity, Sievers distinguished between so-called long and short syllables, that is, syllables that can or cannot be extended (*dehnbar* and *nicht dehnbar*), but he maintained that, although an objective examination of the corpus of alliterative poetry may establish where and under what conditions such syllables will occur, we cannot establish rules about the absolute quantity of the individual syllable of each foot, and therefore not about the factual duration of each foot itself (1893:23-24).

Sievers divided the regular half-line in alliterative poetry into four (rarely five) elements: two strongly stressed lifts and two less strongly stressed syllables, with the distinction between the two entities being determined by the hierarchy of natural sentence stress (1893:25). The lifts were usually made up of phonetically heavily stressed syllables, more rarely of heavy derivational or inflectional suffixes, which, according to Sievers, already in prose carried strong secondary stress (ibid.). He divided the more weakly stressed elements in the poetic half-line into two groups according to their natural sentence stress: unstressed syllables (dips) and syllables with secondary stress (ibid.). Syllables carrying secondary stress were, in Sievers's definition, second elements in compounds, long medial syllables in trisyllabic words with long root syllables, and also heavy derivational syllables (1893:26).[16] Metrically, he treated such syllables in different ways: if they

follow a lift and are line final, they are measured according to the lift and count as dips ("heavy or secondarily stressed dips"). If they occur in a trisyllabic foot with a lift and a dip, they are stressed more weakly than the lift and more strongly than the dip and constitute dependent medial elements between fully stressed lifts and unstressed dips, retaining their value as metrical elements, regardless of whether they are pronounced strongly or weakly (Sievers 1893:28).

According to Sievers, the lift was usually made up of a long syllable, but this long syllable ($\checkmark$) could be replaced by the sequence of a short stressed syllable plus an unstressed syllable of optional quantity ($\checkmark$×: resolution [*Auflösung*]; 1893:27). Similarly, the sequence of a short unstressed syllable plus an unstressed syllable of optional quantity could fill the position of one long unstressed syllable (neutralization) (ibid.).[17] However, that same sequence was unresolved and occupied two metrical positions (a lift plus a dip) if it immediately followed a stressed syllable (with primary or secondary stress; i.e., the shortened lift in Sievers's Types C and A2k, cf. Craigie's law). In such cases, Sievers claims, the two lifts were not necessarily pronounced with equally strong stress: their intensity was governed by the levels of sentence stress, rhythm, and rhetorical requirements (ibid.). For instance, equal intensity in a Type C-line (×$\checkmark\checkmark$×) would, in his opinion, produce a poor impression: in such cases the second lift had no more emphasis than a syllable with secondary stress, but it nevertheless remained a full lift because it was measured against the following dip (ibid.).

Sievers regarded skaldic *dróttkvætt* meter as an extension of eddic *fornyrðislag*, with the addition of the disyllabic final cadence (1893:99), and the following examples suffice to show how he applied the five-type system to *dróttkvætt* lines (see also Sievers 1885a:526-31, 1893:99-105):

Type A	$\acute{-}×\mid\acute{-}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv I, 4:6	jǫfra liðs í ‖ miðli
Type A2k	$\acute{-}\grave{-}\mid\acute{\smile}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv I, 4:8	Suðrvík Dǫnum ‖ kuðri
Type B	$×\acute{-}\mid×\acute{-}\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv III, 3:1	vasa fýst enn rannk ‖ rastir
Type C1	$×\acute{-}\mid\acute{-}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv I, 4:5	þás ólítill ‖ úti
Type C3	$×\acute{-}\mid\acute{\smile}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv II, 1:5	kannk sigrviðum ‖ segja
Type D1	$\acute{-}\mid\acute{-}\grave{-}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv II, 8:4	hringmiðlǫndum ‖ þingat
		Sigv I, 3:6	leið víkinga ‖ skeiðir
Type D2	$\acute{-}\mid\acute{-}\grave{\smile}×\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv V, 5:2	alldáðgǫfugr ‖ báðum
		Sigv VII, 3:6	snarr Skjalgs vinum ‖ fjarri
Type D4	$\acute{-}\mid\acute{-}×\grave{-}\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv I, 5:8	gekk hilmis lið ‖ rekkum
		Sigv III, 21:4	þǫrf nótt ok dag ‖ sóttum
Type E1	$\acute{-}\grave{-}×\mid\acute{-}\parallel\acute{-}×$	Sigv I, 6:8	Súðvirki lið ‖ búðir
		Sigv lv 6:4	ógndjarft fyr kné ‖ hvarfa
		Sigv II, 5:4	gunnreifum Á ‖ leifi.

Sievers's five-type system was taken over by Kuhn's and, with certain modifications, this system served as the framework for his overview of syntactic types of fillers in *dróttkvætt* lines (1983:53, 92-97, see also, Chap. 1, pp. 16-20). Unlike Sievers, who regarded internal rhyme as merely a new adornment (1893:51), Kuhn maintained that such rhymes had a function in the organization of lines and stanzas, and also during recitation (1983:85-86). In his opinion, then, internal rhymes were metrically relevant, and he made the placement of internal rhymes one of the criteria for his divisions into metrical subgroups (1983:92-97). Kuhn also abolished Sievers's notion of metrical feet: according to Kuhn, the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines was defined by recurring syntactic units (syntactic fillers) that under the same metrical conditions fill the two lifts on one side of his syntactic caesuras. However, in his distribution of stress (primary and secondary) and nonstress, Kuhn followed Sievers, and like Sievers he adhered to Rieger's hierarchy of natural sentence stress and distinguished between the following lexico-grammatical categories (1933:5, 1983:113-24): "sentence particles" (*Satzpartikeln*: substantival pronouns, adverbs, finite verbs, connectives, and predicatives), "formwords" (*Satzteilpartikeln*: proclitic articles, adjectival pronouns, prepositions, and proclitic particles/prefixes), and "nomina" (nouns, adjectives, infinitives, and participles I and II).[18] That classification of lexico-grammatical categories was fundamental for the formulation of Kuhn's laws of sentence particles and sentence introduction.

In an earlier work (Gade 1989), I have shown that Sievers's five-type system as applied by Kuhn is insufficient to describe the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines. This inadequacy is most clearly reflected in Kuhn's treatment of disyllabic compounds with two long elements, in his subsequent inability to distinguish between Types A2k and Dk, and D4 and E4 (Kuhn 1983:92, 94, 98, 141; see also Sievers 1893:104-05; cf. Gade 1989:39-43), and in his distribution of syntactic caesuras (depending on his distribution of stress), which is frequently at cross-purposes with the syntactic strucure of the lines. To give an example: Kuhn contends that disyllabic compounds of the form SS cannot carry two primary stresses (1983:100, 107, 108, 141). Hence he, with Sievers, assigns such odd lines as Eil III, 1:1 *setbergs kveða / sitja* to Type A2k, and Eg I, 1:5 *Aðalsteinn of vann / annat* to Type E with full stress on the verbs in positions 3-4 and 4 and with syntactic caesuras after position 4. The placement of these caesuras is determined by Kuhn's "rule of syntactic coherence," according to which primary and secondary lifts falling between the two alliterative staves in odd lines always belong syntactically to the preceding lift (Kuhn 1983:67, 91, 100; Gade 1989:37). In odd lines, in which only verbs can occupy positions 3-4 (A2k) and 4 (E), this distribution of stress and the subsequent placement of syntactic caesuras cause the verbs to be separated from an immediate constituent (here: aux.+V, V+dir. obj.). In even lines, with no restrictions on the lexico-grammatical filler, positions 3-6 are more often than not filled by nominal phrases (e.g., Rdr 13:8 *vallrauf fjogur haufuð*, Eg I, 2:2

hreinbraut Aðalsteini, Haustl 8:2 *fangsæll of veg langan*, Haustl 1:4 *raddkleif at Þórleifi*). In such cases, when the syntactic structure clearly speaks against a syntactic caesura after position 4, Kuhn redefines the lines as Dk (or A2k) and D4 (or E) respectively, and he places the caesuras after position 2 in keeping with the syntax, thus tacitly assuming full stress on the second element of the compound and secondary stress on the elements in positions 3-4 and 4 (Kuhn 1983:96-97).

It is not clear why the compounds *setbergs* and *Aðalsteinn* (with resolution on the first element) should be stressed differently than *vallrauf, hreinbraut, fangsæll*, and *raddkleif* in lines of similar syllabic structure, nor does it immediately follow that the words in positions 3-4 (*kveða, fjogur, Aðal-*, and *vann, veg, Þór-*) should receive primary stress in odd lines and secondary stress in even lines. Furthermore, from a syntactic point of view it is difficult to understand why a syntactic caesura should be allowed to separate the elements of a verbal phrase in odd lines, but not the elements of a nominal phrase in even lines. If the verb in positions 3-4 in odd A2k-lines carries stress it should, according to Kuhn's rule of syntactic coherence, be followed rather than preceded by a syntactic caesura. But if we agree that from syntactic considerations the caesura must fall before the verb, it follows that either the rule of syntactic coherence on which Kuhn bases his distribution of caesuras (and hence his types of syntactic fillers) is invalid in this particular instance, or Kuhn's distribution of stress is wrong.

Rieger's hierarchy of sentence stress was based on his observations of alliterative half-lines with two lifts, and his distribution of stresses presupposes syntactic parataxis or hypotaxis, for example, which words would be marked with +/− alliteration within a syntactic unit. Similarly, Sievers (1893:41-42) explicitly states that, although the levels of lexico-grammatical stress are mostly traditional, the levels of stress in words belonging to one and the same class are determined by their syntactic environment (see also Kuhn 1983:37). However, because of the two extra syllables in the cadence, the syntactic structure of *dróttkvætt* lines differs from that of the alliterative half-line. For example, Sievers's distribution of stress in A2k-lines was based on such lines as Vsp 52:5 *griótbiǫrg gnata*, Vsp 43:7 *sótrauðr hani*, with a syntactic break after position 4. In *dróttkvætt* lines, however, the short-stemmed word in positions 3-4 is always followed by the word in the cadence with which it tends to form a syntactic unit (see the examples above). The question is, then, whether we can assume that a metrical system based on Rieger's hierarchy of sentence stress, which again was derived from syntactic hypotaxis and parataxis in the alliterative half-line, can be transferred without modifications to the *dróttkvætt* line with a different syntactic structure.

To give another example: in alliterative poetry, such E-lines as Hym 7:3 *Ásgarði frá* are not uncommon,[19] but in *dróttkvætt* poetry these lines are almost nonexistent: the only prepositional E-line from the corpus of ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* poetry is Hást 2:8 *várs fundar til skunda*.[20] Although Kuhn in various places comments on the absence of such constructions, he is unable to

offer any explanation as to why they were unsuitable in *dróttkvætt* poetry (1983:43, 121-22, 197). As we have seen, however, no proclitic preposition or particle can occur in position 4 in Sievers's (and Kuhn's) Type E. In eddic lines with a syntactic break after position 4, that preposition was not proclitic but enclitic. In *dróttkvætt* lines with the additional word in the cadence it is clear that, owing to the syntactic cohesion between positions 4 and 5-6, the preposition in position 4 would tend to be reinterpreted as part of a prepositional phrase occupying positions 4-6, thus proclitic and in violation of the structure of the line. This explains why the type *Ásgarði frá* was avoided in *dróttkvætt* and why, in the only early example of such lines, the word in the cadence is a verb rather than a nomen. It also shows the danger inherent in assuming a priori that a metrical system gleaned from one type of poetry can be applied unreservedly to another type of poetry in which the structural principles are different (i.e., the additional lexical unit in positions 5-6, the alliterating stave in position 5 in Types E, D, B, C, and A2k and A3).

Although many scholars agree that Sievers's five-type system, despite its shortcomings, adequately describes the structural peculiarities of *dróttkvætt*, we see from the discussion above that its application to this meter is problematic.[21] We have no proof that Sievers's distribution of primary stress, secondary stress, and nonstress mirrors the conditions of *dróttkvætt*, and indeed Kuhn's vacillating treatment of disyllabic compounds of the form SS and the ensuing distribution of stress in positions 3-4 and 4 in Types A2k and E is representative of a long scholarly tradition of disagreement about the scansions of such lines. Consider the following scansions of an A2k-line:

<div align="center">

HolmgB 1:6 skjaldveðrs reginn aldri

</div>

Sievers (1893:99)	´‒ ǀ ´‿ × ǀ ´‿ ×
Craigie (1900:355)	´ ǀ ´‿ ‿ × ǀ ´‿ ×
J. Turville-Petre (1969:331)	´‒ ‿ × ǀ ´‿ ×
Brennecke (1971)	´´‿ × ´ ×
von See (1967:46)	´‒ ‿ × ´ ×
Kuhn (1983:96)	$\frac{''}{o}$ ´ ‿ × ǀ $\frac{´}{o}$ × or $\frac{''}{o}$ ‒ ‿ × ǀ $\frac{´}{o}$ ×

It is clearly of little consequence for the simple classification of *dróttkvætt* lines according to types (see Kuhn's types of syntactic fillers) whether position 2 or position 3 receives full stress, as long as the system is applied consistently. But when the placement and quality of stress à la Sievers are used to generate universal rules and laws and to predict syntactic coherence and syntactic disruption, we must proceed with extreme care.

I have argued elsewhere that the concept "stress" (word stress, sentence stress, primary and secondary stress, nonstress) is a matter of phonetic realization, not a metrical property, and since we cannot retrieve the actual performance of

dróttkvætt poetry, the term should be avoided in the description of the structure of such poetic lines (Gade 1989:49). I am denying neither that the lexico-grammatical hierarchy discovered by Rieger was a constitutive component in the structure of alliterative poetry nor that the relative weight of the individual categories in a given syntactic environment must have been closely connected with similar conditions in the spoken language. My main objection is that the designation of these categories by terms derived from the realm of phonology imbues the system with a set of properties that belong to a level (phonetic realization) about which we know very little. Such a stress-based metrical system frequently leads to confusion between the metrical and phonetic levels, and it prompts scansions that depend on the subjective instinct of the individual scholar (e.g., in the parts of lines not marked by alliteration, as in Type A2k, above).[22] In order to describe the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines as objectively as possible, one should therefore try to employ a terminology and a system of graphic representation that cannot cause confusion or leave room for subjective interpretations. At the same time such a system should incorporate all the constitutive elements of the *dróttkvætt* line, namely, alliteration, internal rhyme, syllabic length, and lexico-grammatical categories. Such a system will be presented and discussed in more detail below (pp. 46-49).

The Analysis of Dróttkvætt *Poetry according to Current Metrical Theory*

In a recent contribution to the study of *dróttkvætt* meter, *The Rhythms of Dróttkvætt and Other Old Icelandic Metres* (1991), Kristján Árnason attempts to arrive at a metrical "set" that can accommodate not only the rhythm of *dróttkvætt*, but also those of *fornyrðislag, hrynhent, runhent,* and *ljóðaháttr*.[23] Kristján criticizes Sievers's five-type system as overly complicated and for making distinctions that are not warranted by the data, especially in Sievers's Types D and E (1991:95). Following William Sidney Allen (1973:104-5), Kristján distinguishes between four different poetic levels: form ("*dróttkvætt* stanza" or "*dróttkvætt* line"), structure (sequences of "strong" and "weak" positions within a given form), composition (the implementation of structure in terms of linguistic realization), and performance (Kristján Árnason 1991:10). According to Kristján, the levels "form" and "structure" are abstract entities that constitute the domain of meter, and rhythmical pattern is "an abstract entity, a grid or template, defining strong and weak positions in the metrical forms" (1991:10). These levels can be described schematically as follows (Gade, 1993):

Form:	*dróttkvætt* line
Structure:	S W S W S W
Composition:	undrask ǫglis landa. (Þorm lv 25:1)

In *dróttkvætt* meter, the class of linguistic entities which can perform the metrical position of filling a strong position is, Kristján argues, a heavily stressed syllable (in his notation "–"). Conversely, a light syllable ("*") fills a weak position (1991:10-11). The sequences of S's and W's, then, constitute the metrical structure, and the "–" (heavily stressed syllable in strong position) and "*" (light syllable in weak position) describe the compositional level (1991:11).

Based on this system, Kristján establishes three basic rhythmical patterns of the *dróttkvætt* with certain subgroups (1991:41, 124-30):

A   SWSWSW: –   *   – *   –   *
     Þorm lv 25:1 undrask ǫglis landa

A2   SWSWSW: –   * *   –   *   –   *   (with neutralization in position 2)
     Tindr II, 2:6   sverðs nema hefndir verði

A3   SWSWSW: –   *   –   * *   –   *   (with neutralization in position 4)
     Dagst 1:8   sunnan lágt meðal runna

A4   SWSWSW: * * *   –   *   –   *   (with resolution in position 1)
     SigvSt 2:4   boðit til ǫls kvað Fǫlski

B   SSWWSW: –   –   * *   –   *
     Sigv I, 4:8   Suðrvík Dǫnum kuðri
     Ht 1:6   ungr stillir sá milli

B2   SSWWSW: * *   –   *   *   –   *   (with alliteration in position 4)
     Gkǫrt 1:3   glaðan hyggjum svan seðja

C   WSSWSW: *   –   –   *   –   *
     Sturl II, 2:5   ok valkǫstu vestan

These rhythmical types, which are derived from the two types suggested by Craigie (1900) in his criticism of Sievers, in reality represent an extreme simplification of Sievers's system. Kristján's A-pattern corresponds to Sievers's Type A (trochaic), Sievers's Types D and E (and B?) are conflated into the B-pattern, and the C-pattern is similar to Sievers's Type C.

The advantage of Kristján Árnason's patterns is that we no longer have to operate with different degrees of stress (primary and secondary) on the metrical level. But unfortunately Kristján pays scant attention to other constitutive features of the *dróttkvætt* line. In his B2-pattern, for instance, the word in position 4 is designated as W, although it carries alliteration, and he makes no attempt to account for the syntactic fillers of the lines. Hence such lines as Haustl 13:8

bifkleif at Þórleifi, 18:1 *fjǫrspillir lét falla*, Hást 2:5 *en tolf af glað Gylfa*, (and Hfr V, 15:5 *en dreypilig drúpir*?)[24] are all lumped into the same pattern, regardless of the placement of alliteration and the nature of the syntactic fillers in positions 1 and 4. To justify such a distribution of stress, Kristján claims that "the choice of rhythm was basically independent of alliteration," and "we have no proof that the strongs that carry the alliteration are stronger than the ones that do not" (1991:134, 135). But in the line *en tolf af glað Gylfa*, we are facing the rather curious situation of a nonalliterating bimoric connective occupying a strong position ("heavy stressed syllable"), whereas the alliterating nomen in position 4 is weak, not strong (see 1991:142). This circumstance is even more puzzling in view of the fact that Kristján (1991:77-80) seems to accept the premises of Rieger's hierarchy of sentence stress, which derived from the placement of alliterative staves, and Kristján also claims that the syllabification he detects in position 4 of his B-lines was caused by "the laws of sentence-stress in Old Icelandic" (1991:123). In his pursuit of simplicity, Kristján is not only forced to disregard features that are constitutive of *dróttkvætt* lines, but also gets entangled in a web of contradictory statements (see Gade, 1993). Apart from disposing of the concept of secondary stress, Kristján's rhythmical types appear to offer no viable alternative to Sievers's five-type system.

Toward a New System of Graphic Representation of Dróttkvætt *Lines*

From this discussion one can see that neither Sievers's five-type system nor the rhythmical patterns suggested by Kristján Árnason adequately account for the structural peculiarities of *dróttkvætt*. Kuhn (1983) has amply demonstrated that Sievers's types are sufficient for arriving at a classification of such lines; however, most of the laws and rules that Kuhn formulated for this type of poetry are derived from his distribution of stress (or the converse) and that distribution again follows the stress patterns that Sievers discerned from the syntax and placement of alliteration in the alliterative half-line. The fallacies inherent in this approach were exemplified by Kuhn's treatment of A2k- and D-lines, and will become clearer in subsequent chapters of this book.

For the purpose of arriving at a system of graphic representation that will enable us to describe the structure of *dróttkvætt* lines as objectively as possible, I have decided therefore to abandon the concept of stress altogether and to focus on describing such entities as alliteration, internal rhyme, syllabic length, and lexico-grammatical categories. This system makes no claim to represent an abstract metrical level (in terms of "stress" [Sievers], "alternating rhythms" [Kristján Árnason], or "beats" [Heusler]), but focuses on the level of lexical realization and the distribution of metrical markers (Kristján Árnason's "compositional" level). While such an approach might appear unorthodox and a step in the wrong

direction,[25] it has the advantage of focusing on the tasks at hand: namely, to elucidate the restrictions on syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines and on skaldic word order and sentence patterns; to unravel the principles behind the composition of *dróttkvætt* and show what circumstances must have facilitated the comprehension of such poetry; and, finally, to shed some light on the origin and eventual demise of *dróttkvætt* meter.

The system that I use to classify *dróttkvætt* lines employs the following graphic symbols:

$\bar{\times}$ denotes a monosyllabic nomen with three or more morae or a trimoric[+] element in a disyllabic, trisyllabic, or tetrasyllabic word belonging to any lexical category;

$\breve{\times}$ denotes a bimoric monosyllabic nomen, the bimoric element in a disyllabic, trisyllabic, tetrasyllabic, or pentasyllabic word belonging to any lexical category, or a monosyllabic bimoric[+] word belonging to any lexical category except the category "formword" (i.e., prepositions, proclitic particles *of*, *at*, and definite article *enn*);

$\times$ is a syntactically bound particle (either a proclitic formword or an enclitic inflectional ending);

//   denotes alliteration;

o   denotes internal rhyme.[26]

The application of these symbols to *dróttkvætt* lines poses certain unavoidable problems. For example, in such lines as Rdr 14:3 *afls við úri þæfðan* and Haustl 19:3 *hvein í hjarnar mæni*, position 1 can be filled by a long nomen, a verb, adverb, or pronoun, but not by a preposition. Conversely, positions 2 and 4 in lines like Korm lv 6:7 *hrings við Hǫrn at manga*, can be occupied by formwords, enclitic endings, verbs, adverbs, and pronouns, but not by nomina.[27] To put it differently: certain positions allow a filler from categories $\bar{\times}$ and $\breve{\times}$, but not from $\times$; others can be filled by $\breve{\times}$ and $\times$, but not by $\bar{\times}$ or by $\breve{\times}$ (nominal). In such cases the designation follows the maximal/minimal filler, that is, $\bar{\times}$ and $\times$ respectively. Also, in certain cases the distinction of nominal length appears to be neutralized. Consider the second and third elements in the trisyllabic and tetrasyllabic compounds in the following lines (Kuhn's Types Dl/Dk and Cl/Ck):

Rdr 12:2	salpenn**ingi** kenna
Sindr 4:2	skautjal**faðar** Gauta
Haustl 3:6	már val**kastar** báru
Gldr 4:8	rǫdd dyn**skotum** kvǫddusk

Rdr 13:7   fyr vinj*eyjar* víðri
Haustl 18:7   en Berg*dana* bægði.

In such lines, position 3 will be designated by X̆̄.

Because Sievers's five-type system was based on the placement of alliteration and on Rieger's lexico-grammatical categories infused with levels of stress, the system I suggest here does to a certain extent overlap with and complement the one employed by Kuhn (1983). To make a comparison easier, I have chosen therefore to retain the Sievers-Kuhn terminology in my description of the different types (ABCDE), but my designation of subgroups differs from that of Kuhn. In this system we can distinguish between the following main types of lines (exemplified in terms of nominal fillers):

Odd Lines	*Even Lines*

I: Types E and B, with an enclitic or a proclitic × in position 4.

Type E: ⫻X̄̆××̆⫻× or ⫻X̄̆××̆o×

	E1: ⫻X̄̆××̆o×
	Korm lv 4:6 Happþægibil krapta
	Korm lv 7:6 Hǫrbeiðisif greiðir
	E2: ⫻X̄̆××̆o×
	Haustl 13:6 Finns iljabrú minni
	Haustl 20:4 ryðs hœlibǫl gœli
E3: ⫻X̄̆××̆⫻×	*E3*: ⫻X̄̆××̆o×
Gráf 6:7 ofvæginn réð jǫfri	GSúrs 5:8 sjónhesli bǫlgrónu
Gldr 8:1 menfergir bar margar	Hfr III, 29:2 hugreifum Áleifi
XE3: X̄̆X̆×⫻⫻×	
Gldr 5:3 rauð fnýsti ben blóði	
Eg lv 5:3 né fágak dul drjúgan	
Korm lv 5:7 þat skyldak kyn kvinna	
E4: ⫻X̄̆××̆⫻×	*E4*: ⫻X̄̆××̆o×
Glúmr lv 1:3 folkrakkr of vann fylkir	Eg lv 10:4 Þórólfr í gný stórum
Gráf 7:5 víðlendr of bað vinda	

XE4: x̄x̄x////x
Hfr III, 14:3 blóð kom á þrǫm þíðan
Hást 2:5   en tolf af glað Gylfa
Korm lv 30:7 verit hefr í þrym þremja

Type B: x//xx̃//x
Haustl 2:7   vasa Byrgitýr bjarga

II: Types D, A2k, and C, with an enclitic × in position 4.

Type D: //x̄x̄x//x and //x̄x̄xox

D1: //x̄x̄x//x
Hfr I, 3:3   barrhaddaða byrjar
Korm I, 4:3   glaðfœðandi Gríðar

D1: //x̄x̄xox
Eyv lv 13:4   sporðfjǫðruðum norðan
Hfr V, 24:2   þunnísunga Gunni

D2: //x̄x̄x//x
Rdr 5:3   segls naglfara siglur
GSúrs 14:7   veðrs Skjǫldunga valdi
Korm I, 7:3   ýs bifvangi Yngva

D2: //x̄x̄xox
Rdr 8:8   baug ørlygis draugi
ÓTr 1:4   hérs Akkerisfrakki
Eg lv 6:2   ulfs tannlituðr glitra

Type A2k: //x̄xx//x and //x̄xxox
Eil III, 1:1 setbergs kveða sitja
Gldr 7:3   svartskyggð bitu seggi

Eg I, 1:8   hrannbrjótr konungmanni
Hfr I, 8:4   hryngráp Egils vápna

Type C: x//x̄x//x
GSúrs 35:5   ok Eldnjǫrun ǫldu
Vell 7:5   ok rauðmána reynir

III: Type A with an enlitic or proclitic × in positions 2 and 4.

Type A: //x̄//x//x and //xx̄xox

A1: //x//xox
A1[1] Korm lv 53:3 fægir Fjǫlnis veigar
A1[2] Korm lv 5:3   Eir of aptanskœrur
A1[3] Gráf 2:7   sunnr á sigr of hlynninn
A1[4] Sindr 8:5   gerra gramr í snerru

A: //xx̄xox
A[1] Gráf 10:2   heggir mækis eggja
A[2] Haustl 18:8 brjótr við jǫrmunþrjóti
A[3] Eg lv 16:6 norn til arfs of borna
A[4] Eg lv 1:8   hǫggva mann ok annan

A2: ⫽×x̄x×⫽×

A2¹	Hfr III, 10:1	eigi látask ýtar			
A2³	Bragi II, 3:1	eld of þák af jǫfri			
A2⁴	Gráf 4:1	hilmir rauð und hjalmi			
A2⁵	Eyv lv 12:3	birkihind of bundit	A⁵	Rdr 16:4	Jǫrmungandr at sandi.

A3: x̄×⫽×⫽×

A3¹	Hfr V, 10:5	láta allir ýtar
A3²	Korm lv 7:7	dýr verðr Fægifreyja
A3³	Eg lv 8:5	áðr á sund fyr sandi
A3⁴	Hfr II, 6:7	blǫkku brúnt at drekka

The types comprised in each of the three main groups display the same syllabic structure before the cadence with different syntactic organization. Group I (E, B, XE) has the sequence x̄x̄ followed by an enclitic (E1, E2, E3, XE3) or a proclitic × (E4, XE4) and x̆, or a proclitic × in position 1, followed by the same sequence (B). In group II (D, A2k, C), positions 1-2 are filled by x̄x̄ (D, A2k) followed by the sequence x̆× with an enclitic in position 4, or position 1 is filled by a proclitic × (C), followed by the same sequence as in D and A2k. Group III consists of lines with the sequence x̄×x̄×x̄×. Each group has a maximal nominal filler (E1 Korm lv 4:6 *Happþægibil krapta*, D1 Eg lv 27:2 *landbeiðaðar reiði*, A¹ GSúrs 9:3 *gætin Gjúkadóttir*, Korm lv 32:6 *tanna Silkinanna*) and the syntactic organization (and the placement of alliteration) determines the division into types and subtypes within each group. The possible syntactic patterns within each of the three main groups can be illustrated as follows (the vertical lines designate lexical boundaries; proclitic formwords are not designated as separate units) :

I: Types E, B

E1:	Happþægibil I krapta	Korm lv 7:6	Hǫrbeiðisif greiðir
E2:	Happ I þægibil I krapta	Haustl 13:6	Finns iljabrú minni
E3:	Happþægi I bil I krapta	Skall 3:5	arghyrnu lát árna
		Haustl 15:6	hógreiðar framm drógu
	Happþægi I bilkrapta	Hfr III, 10:4	folkreifum Áleifi
E4:	Happþæg I i bil I krapta	Haustl 3:5	margspakr of nam mæla
		Kveld 1:4	Þórólf und lok fóru
	Happþæg I i bilkrapta	Haustl 13:8	bifkleif at Þórleifi

B:	× þægibil l krapta	Haustl 2:7	vasa Byrgitýr bjarga
XE3:	Happ l þægi l bil l krapta	Eg lv 5:3	né fágak dul drjúgan
XE4:	Happ l þæg l i bil l krapta	Vell 34:3	hinns fór í gný Gunnar
	Happ l þæg l i bilkrapta	Korm lv 38:1	esa mér sem Tinteini

II: Types D, A2k, C

D1:	landbeiðaðar l reiði	Vell 25:7	folkeflandi fylkir
		Eg lv 41:2	þingbirtingar Ingva
D2:	land l beiðaðar l reiði	Rdr 5:3	segls naglfara siglur
		Haustl 3:6	már valkastar báru
	land l beiðaðarreiði	Hfr V, 4:4	hvars Akkerisfrakki
A2k:	landbeið l aðar l reiði	Gldr 7:3	svartskyggð bitu seggi
		Vell 21:2	valmey konungr heyja
	landbeið l aðarreiði	Eg I, 2:2	hreinbraut Aðalsteini
C:	× l beiðaðar l reiði	Rdr 17:3	á haussprengi Hrungnis

III[1]: Type A Odd

A1[1]:	gætin l Gjúka l dóttur	Skall 2:3	váðir Vidda bróður
	gætin l Gjúkadóttur	Eg lv 42:1	áttkak erfinytja
A1[2]:	gæt l in l Gjúka l dóttur	Haustl 5:1	fljótt bað foldar dróttinn
	gæt l in l Gjúkadóttur	Gldr 1:3	óðr við œskimeiða
A1[3]:	gæt l in l Gjúk l a dóttur	Haustl 8:5	þá varð Þórs of rúni
A1[4]:	gætin l Gjúk l a dóttur	Korm lv 47:1	aura gafk á eyri
A2[1]:	eigi l látask l ýtar	Hfr III, 10:1	eigi látask ýtar
A2[2]:	No lines		

A2³:　　eig| i | lát | ask ýtar　　　　　Gráf 11:7　　séa getr þar til sælu

A2⁴:　　eigi | lát | ask ýtar　　　　　　Hfr II, 2:1　　hilmir lét at Holmi
　　　　　　eigilát | ask ýtar　　　　　　　Rdr 18:3　　　hrøkkviáll of hrokkinn

A3¹:　　hugðak | Geymi | gǫndul　　　　Þmáhl 5:7　　sleitka líknar leiki
　　　　　　hugðak | Geymigǫndul　　　　GSúrs 28:1　　hugðak Geymigǫndul

A3²:　　hugð | ak | Geymi | gǫndul　　HolmgB 13:7 rauðk á brynju beiði
　　　　　　hugð | ak | Geymigǫndul　　Eyv lv 6:7　　nú tregr Gætigauta

A3³:　　hugð | ak | Geym | i gǫndul　Gldr 8:3　　　lundr vann sókn á sandi

A3⁴:　　hugðak | Geym | i gǫndul　　Eg VI, 1:3　　hyggi þegn til þagnar

III²: Type A Even

A¹:　　tanna | Silki | nanna　　　　Hfr V, 7:4　　iðjur várra niðja
　　　　　tanna | Silkinanna　　　　　Eg lv 12:4　　heiðis vingameiði

A²:　　tann | a | Silki | nanna　　Hfr III, 2:2　　menn at vápna sennu
　　　　　tann | a | Silkinanna　　　Þmáhl 7:6　　　baugs fyr óðaldraugi

A³:　　tann | a | Silk | i nanna　Korm lv 34:2 skald á búð til kalda

A⁴:　　tanna | Silk | i nanna　　Eg lv 30:4　　rjóðum sverð í blóði
　　　　　tannaSilk | i nanna　　　Gldr 4:6　　　orðalaust at morði.

The syntactic configurations within each group will be discussed in detail in Chapters 4-6. The next chapter will be devoted to discussions of structural peculiarities that have a bearing on the examination of syntactic fillers in Chapter 4, namely, Kuhn's law of the caesura; long syllables in enclitic ×-position; resolution, neutralization, and elision; and syllabification in compounds and syllabic/syntactic cohesion.

Structural Peculiarities

Kuhn's Law of the Caesura and Syntactic Breaks in Dróttkvætt *Lines*

As was shown in the preliminary discussion on word order in Chapter 1, the complexity of skaldic syntax continues to pose problems for editors and translators of *dróttkvætt* poetry, and, despite the attempts that have been made to unravel this riddle (Reichardt 1928; Wood 1952; Korin 1969; D. Edwards 1983; Kuhn 1933, 1983), nobody has so far been able to establish definite norms for the word order and sentence intercalations in *dróttkvætt* stanzas.

In his review of Konstantin Reichardt's *Studien zu den Skalden des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts* (1928), Hans Kuhn formulated several rules concerning the word order and structure of *dróttkvætt* lines, among them the law of the caesura (*Zäsurgesetz*; Kuhn 1929:199).[1] According to that law, all *dróttkvætt* lines contain a syntactic caesura that falls in odd lines between the staves and in even lines most frequently between the two rhyming syllables. Although scholars later pointed out that the law of the caesura assigned syntactic breaks frequently at odds with the syntactic structure of the lines (Hollander 1953:196-97), Kuhn rejected the criticism and maintained that the law of the caesura was based on the old rules of sentence stress, and, when his distribution of caesuras conflicted with the actual syntactic configuration of a line, these rules were stronger than the syntactic organization (Kuhn 1969a:220; see also 1983:132-33). Kuhn's law of the caesura became the organizing principle for his subdivision of types of syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines (see, Chap. 1, pp.18-20), and, despite the criticism leveled against it (Hollander 1953; Gade 1988), this law has been universally accepted by scholars.[2]

A look at Kuhn's types of syntactic fillers in odd lines shows that his distribution of caesuras more often than not violates the syntactic structures of the lines, especially when the caesura falls directly before the alliterating stave in position 5 (our groups I-II and A2, A3). In his Type A3, for example, with alliteration in positions 3 and 5, Kuhn places the syntactic caesura after positions 3 or 4:

Gldr 5:1	háði gramr I þars gnúðu
Haustl 15:1	knáttu oll I en Ullar
Rdr 6:1	mjok lét stála I støkkvir
Haustl 5:5	en af breiðu I bjóði.

In the first two examples, the syntactic breaks mark the onset of a new clause with an introductory element, but in the last two lines, the caesuras separate two elements of a nominal phrase. Similar violations occur in Kuhn's Types D, A2k, C, E, B, XE, XB, and A2. Consider the following examples from his discussion of syntactic fillers (1983:133-84):

Haustl 18:3	bǫlverðungar I Belja	(*D*: N+attr. gen.)
Glumr I, 2:3	blakkríðandi I bakka	(*D*: N+attr. gen.)
Eil III, 1:1	setbergs kveða I sitja	(*A2k*: aux.+V)
Gldr 7:3	svartskyggð bitu I seggi	(*A2k*: V+dir. obj.)
Gldr 7:5	þás hugfylldra I hǫlða	(*C*: attr. adj.+N)
Eyv lv 9:5	nús alfrǫðull I elfar	(*C*: N+attr. gen.)
Haustl 18:1	fjǫrspillir lét I falla	(*E*: aux.+V)
Jór 5:5	raunframra brá I rimmu	(*E*: V+Dir. Obj.)
Haustl 2:7	vasa Byrgitýr I bjarga	(*B*: N+attr. gen.)
Haustl 9:3	þás ellilyf I ása	(*B*: N+attr. gen.)
Eg lv 10:5	jǫrð grœr en vér I verðum	(*XE*: S+V)
Eg lv 19:1	svá skyldi goð I gjalda	(*XE*: S+V)
Eg lv 5:3	né fágak dul I drjúgan	(*XB*: N+attr. adj.)
Gráf 11:5	en ek veit at hefr I heitit	(*XB*: aux.+V)
Hfr III, 10:1	eigi látask I ýtar	(*A2*: V+S).

The structure of odd A1-lines, with alliteration in positions 1 and 3, prompted the formulation of the law of the caesura (Kuhn 1983:92, 135). Although syntactic breaks usually are quite prominent in this type of line (e.g., Eg lv 11:7 *helt I né hrafnar sultu*), the caesuras sometimes separate syntactic units or occur in lines with no apparent breaks in word order:

Rdr 5:7	hǫrðum I herðimýlum	(attr. adj.+N)
Rdr 15:3	œgir I ǫflugbarða	(N+attr. gen.)
Vell 8:3	sverða I sverrifjarðar	(attr. gen.+N)
Hfr III, 7:7	víðis I veltireiðar	(attr. gen. +N)
Rdr 8:7	bar I til byrjar drǫsla	(V+PP)
Rdr 10:1	letrað I lýða stillir	(V+S)
Eg lv 19:3	reið I sé rǫgn ok Óðinn	(Spred.+V)
Styrr 1:5	uggik I eigi seggja	(V+adv.)
HolmgB 8:3	nauðr I hagar nú til frœða	(S+V)
Korm lv 2:5	enn I til ǫkkla svanna	(conn.+PP).

Kuhn observed that the majority of A1-lines contained syntactic breaks between the alliterating staves, and, disregarding the fact that some A1-lines show no breaks at all and that others contain sentence boundaries that do not fall between the

alliterating staves (e.g., Eg lv 11:3 *ótt vas él / þats sóttak*, Korm lv 51:1 *ek verð opt / þvít þykkjum*, HolmgB 13:5 *opt hefk ýfzk / þás heiptir*), he gave universal status to a tendency and formulated the law of the caesura.

In his first rejoinder to Hollander's criticism, Kuhn ascribed the placement of the caesuras to the old rules of sentence stress (Kuhn 1969a:220). It is difficult to understand why these rules should mandate an obligatory syntactic break in *dróttkvætt* lines, especially in view of Kuhn's own statement that the old rules of sentence stress appear to be often violated in the ninth century and inoperative by the tenth century (Kuhn 1983:202). From the ninth century onward, *dróttkvætt* stanzas contain lines without syntactic interruption, as well as lines with syntactically incomplete phrases and sentence boundaries. Consider the following examples from Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa":

Rdr 3:1	knátti eðr við illan
Rdr 3:3	með dreyrfáar dróttir
Rdr 3:5	rósta varð í ranni
Rdr 4:1	flaut of set við sveita
Rdr 2:3	meyjar hjóls enn mæri
Rdr 4:3	hræva dǫgg I þars hǫggnar.

As is shown by the following lines, syntactic disruption occurred in eddic poetry, too:

Vsp 22:5	seið hon, hvars hon kunni
Hym 6:1	veiztu, ef þiggiom
HH I, 17:5	hugg ec, at vér eigim
HH II, 21:5	mál er, Hǫðbroddr
Vkv 5:9	qvánar, ef hánom
HHj 35:3	flióð eitt, er hann
HHj 39:3	buðlungr, sá er var
Vsp 62:7	vel, valtívar
HH II, 45:5	grætr þú, gullvarið
HHj 33:3	ǫlmál, Heðinn.

The existence of syntactic breaks in eddic poetry, however, has never been ascribed to the law that eddic lines always contain syntactic caesuras. Owing to the more convoluted word order, such breaks occur more frequently in *dróttkvætt* than in eddic poetry, but it is difficult to believe that all *dróttkvætt* lines were divided by syntactic caesuras, especially when no such breaks are evident in the syntactic organization of the line.

Nobody has yet given a satisfactory definition of the term "syntactic caesura" in *dróttkvætt* poetry. When Kuhn formulated the law in 1929, he referred to the

caesura as "the strongest syntactic break" ("der stärkste syntaktische Einschnitt") in the line (1929:199). In *Das Dróttkvætt*, he uses the terms "caesura" ("Zäsur") or "break" ("Einschnitt"), and those terms apparently encompass disrupted word order, syntactic incompletion, and sentence boundaries, as well as lines in which none of these features are evident (1983:67, 70, 89-90, 95, 132-33, 153). In his earlier criticism of Ernst A. Kock's and Finnur Jónsson's editorial principles, Kuhn (1934:414) argued that the language of the ninth and tenth centuries, and especially the language of poetry, could have been subject to other rules than was thirteenth-century prose and that *dróttkvætt* poetry may have followed its own rules of word order. It is certainly true that the syntax of ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* cannot be measured with the yardstick of thirteenth-century prose, and we cannot exclude the possibility that an indigenous poetic "syntactic" system might have operated within the stanzas and facilitated the comprehension of this type of poetry for listeners familiar with those conventions. But if such conventions indeed existed, it is difficult to believe that, in poetic lines containing a wealth of sentence boundaries, disrupted syntactic units, and embedded phrases, these conventions would superimpose an additional system of "syntactic caesuras" and obscure the word order to an even greater extent.

The question is then, what constitutes a syntactic caesura in skaldic lines? *Dróttkvætt* stanzas contain an abundance of such E3-lines as Hfr III, 15:7 *Surts ættar vinnk sléttan* ‖ *sylg*, Eg lv 9:3 *þingharðan frák þengil*. According to Kuhn, these lines are divided by a syntactic caesura after position 4. A random glance at the readings in Gordon's *An Introduction to Old Norse*, however, yields the following prose sentences: *Góðan eigum vér konung, Þau einn hefi ek sár* (Gordon 1986:125, 126), which show that such disrupted constructions were part and parcel of thirteenth-century prose, too. From a syntactic point of view, then, there seems to be no more reason to assume a syntactic caesura in *Surts ættar vinnk sléttan* and *Þingharðan frák þengil*, than in Haustl 18:1 *fjǫrspillir lét falla* and ÞHjalt 2:5 *þat eitt lifir þeira*. Although the word order in *dróttkvætt* stanzas was certainly subject to restrictions imposed by formal and artistic requirements, it would be wrong to believe that the fundamental conventions underlying the syntax of *dróttkvætt* varied significantly from those of prose (even as late as the thirteenth century) and that, for instance, a sentence boundary was no sentence boundary and syntactic breaks fell between the two elements of a compound (e.g., Rdr 13:3 *svát af renni-* ‖ *rauknum*). But an attempt to arrive at an exact definition of what constitutes a "syntactic break" in *dróttkvætt* lines, short of tangible sentence boundaries, appears to be an exercise in futility. Discussions of the different types of syntactic fillers in Chapters 4-6 will therefore incorporate information about the placement of sentence boundaries (marked with a slash /), but syntactic incompletion will otherwise be left unmarked.

Skjalfhent, tvískelft, *and Long Syllables in Enclitic Position*

In A[1]- and A[2]-lines, an enclitic x-position is sometimes filled by a bimoric or trimoric nominal syllable (Kuhn's *schwere Senkungen* or "heavy dips"; Kuhn 1983:104-6). There are not more than thirty-two such lines from the ninth and tenth centuries, and most of them occur in position 4 in odd lines. Consider the following examples:

	Odd Lines		*Even Lines*
TE 4:1	eru til míns *fjǫrs* margir	Eg lv 8:2	hríð fyr Jót*lands* síðu
TE 2:1	rekit hefk Rǫgn*valds* dauða	Korm lv 3:6	síðan goll*mens* Fríðar
Eg lv 30:1	hǫggum hjalt*vǫnd* skyggðan	Korm lv 3:8	Hlínar ó*þurft* mína
Jór 2:3	sýnisk svart*leitr* reyni	Hfr V, 18:8	ganga dýr*ligr* angi
Jór 2:1	Haralds frák Half*dan* spyrja	Hfr V, 21:8	sínum á*byrgð* mína
Sindr 1:3	mœtr hlóð mild*ingr* Jótum		
Eyv lv 10:3	bellir bragn*ingr* elli		
Eyv lv 10:7	fyllik flokk *þinn* stillir		
Korm lv 13:5	veitk at hrím*ugr* hlúki		
Korm lv 42:3	enn emk auð*spǫng* ungri		
Korm lv 42:7	áðr an jafn*fǫgr* tróða		
Korm lv 52:1	hins mun Hǫr*gefn* spyrja		
Korm lv 54:7	hǫgg hlaut hug*laus* dugga		
GSúrs 15:3	árr nema all*gótt* heyrir		
Þjsk IV, 5:1	hrollir hugr *minn* illa		
Þjsk IV, 4:5	eigum bernsk*ligt* báðir		
BNjáll 1:3	dreif á haf*skips* húfa		
Hfr II, 1:3	hraustr þás her*skip* glæsti		
Hfr V, 7:7	legg'k á frum*ver* Friggjar		
Hfr V, 22:3	vér munum dag *hvern* dýra		
Hfr III, 12:3	óðusk malm*þings* meiðar		
Gríss 1:7	þerrir sjá*ligr* svarri.		

Kuhn speculated that there might be a connection between such lines and alliterative lines like Vsp 45:7 *sceggǫld, scálmǫld* and OE *guðrinc goldwlanc* (Beow 1881a), but he was puzzled as to why, in *dróttkvætt* lines, they occurred more frequently in odd than in even lines (Kuhn 1983:105-6). However, the *dróttkvætt* lines above are not structurally similar to such eddic lines as Vsp 45:7 with long nominal syllables in both enclitic x-positions. In *fornyrðislag* lines these constructions always occur in odd lines, and they are characterized by double alliteration (A1) and syntactic coordination (heightened repetition):

Vsp 45:7	sceggǫld, scálmǫld
Vsp 45:9	vindǫld, vargǫld
HH I, 8:3	Sólfiǫll, Snæfiǫll
HH I, 8:5	Hringstǫð, Hátún
HH II, 45:5	sólbiǫrt, súðrœn
HH II, 45:11	úrsvalt, innfiálgt
Gǫr II, 15:7	hiǫrdrót, hiálmdrót
Gǫr II, 33:3	Vínbiǫrg, Valbiǫrg.

In *dróttkvætt* lines, however, there is only one long syllable occupying an x-position, not two, and the possible model for the *dróttkvætt* constructions must be sought in such alliterative half-lines as HH II, 14:1 *sótti Sigrún*, Vsp 24:5 *brotinn var borðveggr* (A1); Gǫr I, 5:1 *þeygi Guðrún*, Vsp 4:3 *þeir er miðgarð* (A3). Whereas this pattern is quite common in odd eddic lines of Types A1 and A3, there are only two such even *fornyrðislag* lines, and odd A2-lines with this structure are virtually nonexistent.[3] That distribution corresponds exactly to what we find in *dróttkvætt*: long nominal syllables occur in position 4 in odd A1- and A3-lines, are totally absent from A2-lines, and are very scarce in even lines. It is clear then that, as far as the "heavy dips" in A-lines are concerned, *dróttkvætt* lines are subject to the same restrictions of distribution as eddic *fornyrðislag*, and, furthermore, it seems to be a requirement that the word with the long enclitic syllable carries alliteration (A1, A3, as opposed to A2 and even lines). It could be that the alliteration lent additional emphasis to the first syllable, thus allowing a long syllable to occupy the position of a short, enclitic syllable, and that, when the feature was lacking (e.g., Type A2 and even lines with alliteration in position 1), such "heavy dips" were avoided.

In Type A[4] (odd A2 and even lines, with alliteration in position 1) there is a small group of lines in which the long syllable falls in position 2 rather than in position 4: Jór 1:1 *bragningr réð í blóði*, Jór 5:3 *Goþþormr hlaut af gæti*, Húsdr 10:1 *kostigr ríðr at kesti*, Jór 3:4 *magnendr bjósk at fagna*. Such lines have no correspondence in eddic lines, but they are closely related to a variant meter of *dróttkvætt*, namely *skjalfhent*. The name *skjalfhent* can be translated as 'the shivering or resounding meter' (Kristensen 1928, Gade 1985:69). Snorri, who clearly took the name to mean "shivering," goes on to tell an anecdote about how the meter was invented by the skald Veili, "when he was weatherbound on some distant skerries after a shipwreck, and they had little clothing and the weather was cold; then he composed that poem which is called the *skjalfhent* lay, or the *drápa* without refrain, and the subject matter was taken from the saga of Sigurðr."[4] According to Snorri, *skjalfhent* is characterized by alliteration in positions 1 and 3 (= A1) and by the first internal rhyme falling in position 1 or on a long nominal syllable in position 2: when this pattern occurs in both odd lines of a *helmingr*, it is called *tvískelft* (twice shivered or resounded; see Ht 28, 35; *SnE* I:638, 646; Kuhn,

1983:333-34). Despite Snorri's assertion that the meter could be attributed to the shivering efforts of Veili, *skjalfhent* lines occur sporadically from the earliest poetry onward and are especially prominent in Kormákr's poems. In the poetry from the ninth and tenth centuries, the meter is carried through consistently only once, in a *lausavísa* attributed to the berserk Leiknir. Not until Hallarsteinn's "Rekstefja" (*Skj* IA:543-552) is *skjalfhent* used as an independent meter throughout a longer poem. The excerpted corpus contains the following ten lines composed in *skjalfhent* meter:

Haustl 15:7	seðr gekk Svǫlnis ekkja
Sindr 6:7	valbrands víðra landa
Korm lv 32:3	gollhlaðs geymiþella
Korm lv 37:7	svefnfátt / sǫrva Gefnar
Korm lv 48:3	eldreið Áta foldar
Korm lv 37:3	allt gjalfr eyja þjalfa
Leiknir 1:1	sólgrund Siggjar linda
Leiknir 1:3	jafnhátt / ǫglis stéttar
Leiknir 1:5	hoddgrund / hvat býr undir
Leiknir 1:7	hyrmælt / hóti fleira.

The name indicates that the pattern could have been used for rhetorical purposes (whether it is translated as 'shivering' or 'resounding'), and the initial cluster of metrical markers (//O//) must have produced quite a singular effect. The placement of alliteration (A1) closely resembles that of such eddic lines as *sceggǫld, scálmǫld*, and, although the *skjalfhent* lines are structurally closer to such *fornyrðislag* lines as Vsp 48:7 *veggbergs vísir*, Vsp 63:5 *vindheim víðan*, the syntax (occasional syntactic breaks after position 2) seems to indicate that the former rather than the latter might have served as a model for skaldic *skjalfhent*.

Lines with enclitic long syllables in an ×-position occur with unusual density in the poetry of Goþþormr Sindri (3 lines) and Jórunn (5 lines; see Kuhn 1983:285). It is very likely that Jórunn, when composing her poem ("Sendibit") about Goþþormr's conciliatory efforts on behalf of Haraldr hárfagri, consciously adopted the formal peculiarities that characterized Goþþormr's own poetry (e.g., Jór 2:1 *Haralds frák Halfdan spyrja*, 5:3 *Goþþormr hlaut af gæti*), thus eulogizing the man as well as his work.

Two other stanzas also indicate that the so-called heavy dips could be used as a rhetorical device. When Eyvindr skaldaspillir is compelled to join forces with King Haraldr Eiríksson against his will, he recites a memorable *lausavísa* (lv 10) proclaiming his faith to his former liege lord, Hákon góði. That stanza contains two violations of correct *dróttkvætt*, both in odd lines, and both involving long enclitic syllables:

Eyv lv 10   Einn dróttin hefk áttan
         jǫfurr dýrr an þik fyrra
         bellir brag*ningr* elli
         biðkat mér ens þriðja;
         trúr vask tyggja dýrum
         tveim skjǫldum lékk aldri
         fyllik flokk *þinn* stillir
         fellr á hendr mér elli.

(One lord I have served, precious prince, before you; old age oppresses me, king, I will not seek a third. I was true to the splendid lord, I never served under two shields; I shall join your troops, king, although old age overcomes me.)

Similarly, Kormákr Ǫgmundarson employs two *skjalfhent* lines in his famous lyric descriptions of nature and lament for his lost love, Steingerðr (lv 37):

Korm lv 37   brim gnýr brattir hamrar
         blálands Haka strandar
         allt gjalfr eyja þjalfa
         út líðr í stað víðis;
         mér kveðk heldr of Hildi
         hrannbliks an þér miklu
         svefnfátt sǫrva Gefnar
         sakna mank ef vaknak.

(The breakers roar, the steep slopes of the beach of the blue land of Haki; all the waves of the enclosure of the islands surge back into the sea. I say I lose more sleep than you over Hildr of the wave light [gold]; I will miss Gefn of the stone necklace [Steinn-Gerðr] if I awake.)

It can be no coincidence that these two stanzas, whose passionate declarations set them apart from the mainstream of skaldic *lausavísur*, both contain the same type of formal violations, and the long enclitic syllables, especially in A1-lines with double alliteration, could indeed have served the same emphatic purposes as in such eddic lines as *sceggǫld, scálmǫld*.

In the examination of syntactic fillers (Chaps. 4-6), *skjalfhent* lines will not be considered, and the other examples of long enclitics will be incorporated in the discussion of Type A (Ch. 6), but they will not receive a special notation (i.e., the long enclitics will be designated as ×).

Resolution and Neutralization

In his "Háttatal," Snorri Sturluson mentions the poetic license of having more than six syllables in the *dróttkvætt* line, provided that they stand close together and are pronounced quickly.[5] As an example of such lines, Snorri gives the following stanza (Ht 8; *SnE* I:608-10, the orthography has been normalized and emphasis added):

Ht 8

Klofinn spyr ek hjalm *fyrir* hilmis
hjarar egg duga seggir
því eru heldr *þar er* skekr skjǫldu
skafin sverð lituð ferðar
bila muna gramr *þó at* gumna
gular rítr nái líta
hvatan brand þrimu randa.

He writes: "Here there are nine syllables in lines one and three, and in lines two and four there are seven. This illustrates the maximal number of syllables that can stand in a line in *dróttkvætt* meter."[6] He also observes that none of the lines in this stanza contains internal rhyme in position 1 and that the superfluous syllables in *dróttkvætt* lines usually occur before the first internal rhyme.

As early as 1878, Sievers formulated his law of syllabic resolution (*Gesetz der Silbenverschleifung*, Sievers 1878:455-56), which states that two short syllables in certain positions could fill the position of one long syllable. He observed that resolution was quite common in positions 1-2, but relatively rare in positions 3-4, and then mostly involving words with low stress (Sievers 1878:456, 468-69, 1893:99). According to Kuhn (1983:56), Old Norse alliterative and skaldic poetry (as well as Old English alliterative poetry) were subject to the following rules of contractions: (1) no enclitic syllable can be resolved; (2) no initial syllable of a polysyllabic word, regardless of the level of stress, can form resolution with a preceding syllable; (3) no medial or final syllable in a word with three or more syllables can be resolved. In eddic poetry, only the first lift tends to be resolved and, similarly, in *dróttkvætt* lines resolution occurs on the first lift (Kuhn 1983:68). As an exception, Kuhn lists the following isolated group of *dróttkvætt* lines from the skalds surrounding the eleventh-century Norwegian king Haraldr harðráði (ibid., cf. Sievers 1878:470):

Anon. X., III C 1:1	hrauð í *himin upp* glóðum
Har. harð. 4:1	sneið fyr *Sikil-ey* víða
Har. harð. 17:5	svín ok *ali-gás* eina
Sneglu-Halli 8:1	gott er *Gula-þing* þetta
Bjarni gullbr. 7:5	vǫkþu *ǫfund-menn* ykkar.

The structure of these lines could, Kuhn suggests, have been influenced by such eddic lines as Vsp 6:1 *þá gengo regin ǫll* (ibid.), and indeed this seems quite likely.

The most conspicuous difference between the use of resolution in eddic and skaldic lines Kuhn finds in his Type C-lines: eddic lines could have a resolved first lift (Vsp 3:4 *né svalar unnir*) and *dróttkvætt* lines could not (ibid.). Kuhn does not speculate on the reasons for this absence, but a look at Type C *fornyrðislag* lines with resolution in position 2 provides the answer. First of all, such resolutions are characteristic of even lines, not of odd lines (the proportions are roughly 1:100), and they are a favorite device for accommodating place names (especially prominent in the Helgi poems).[7] Second, unlike even lines, no odd *fornyrðislag* line has resolution on the first element of a compound but only on a single, disyllabic word, more often than not in lines with double alliteration (e.g., Vsp 9:7 *ór Brimis blóði*, 53:5 *enn bani Belia*, as opposed to Vsp 7:2 *á Iðavelli*, 60:6 *á megindóma*). In *dróttkvætt* lines, however, there are no even C-lines (the main stave always falls in position 1), and positions 2-4 in odd C-lines tend to be filled by a compound, not by two separate words (only 16 out of 189 lines contain two separate elements in positions 2-4). Under such circumstances, it is not so strange that there are no *dróttkvætt* lines of the type †*þás bani Fáfnis bendi*.

Neither Sievers nor Kuhn distinguished between resolution in stressed and unstressed positions in their terminology.[8] However, because contractions on an $\bar{\times}$-syllable seem to be subject to different restrictions than those on an $\times$–syllable, I have chosen to follow Kristján Árnason (1991:33-34, 47) and use the terms resolution ($\breve{\times}\times=\bar{\times}$) and neutralization ($\times\times=\times$), respectively. Resolution and neutralization can occur on bimoric disyllabic words of the types *vita*, *búa*, and *konungr*, as well as on two separate words, the first of which must be bimoric and the second having an initial vowel (*nú emk*, *nú ák*). In B- and C-lines, neutralization in position 1 may occasionally involve two words like *nú hefr*, *þó hykk*, in which the second word could have been abbreviated (*nú'fr*, etc.; Sievers 1878:487-91; Kuhn 1983:67-68).

There appear to be no restrictions on neutralization in *dróttkvætt* lines, that is, all $\times$–positions except enclitic endings can be neutralized. Because Types D1-2, A2k, E1-3, XE3, and A¹ contained no proclitic particles, it follows that neutralization was excluded from those patterns. Consider the following examples:

(1) Neutralization in position 1 (B, C):

Eyv lv 4:1   *baðat* valgrindar vinda
Haustl 3:7   *vasa* Hœnis vinr hánum.

(2) Neutralization in position 2 (A^2, A^3):

Eyv lv 9:7	ráð *eru* ramrar þjóðar
Hfr III, 15:3	sverð *bitu* feigra fyrða
Húsdr 7:4	fyrstr *enum* gollibyrsta
HolmgB 8:3	nauðr *hagar* nú til frœða
Korm lv 44:3	mér *vasa* dagr sás dugði
Eg lv 19:2	gram *reki* bǫnd af lǫndum.

(3) Neutralization in position 3 (E4):

Hfr III, 20:4	dýrbliks *eða* þó kvikvan.

(4) Neutralization in position 4 (A^3, A^4, A^5):

GSúrs 21:1	hverr of veit *nema* hvassan
Eg lv 18:7	digr fló beint *meðal* bjúgra
TE 3:5	þeygi dylk *nema* þykki
Korm lv 46:7	byrjak frægð *nema* fjǫrvi
Haustl 6:7	Hirðitýr *meðal* herða
Skall 2:6	geisla njóts *meðan* þjóta.

Resolution occurs in the following positions of *dróttkvætt* lines:

I: Types E, XE, B

E1:　　No resolution.

E2:　　Resolution in position 1 (even lines only, no resolution on a nomen):

　　　　TE 3:4　　　*bitu* þengils son ungan

E3:　　Resolution in position 1:

　　　　HolmgB 7:5　*toro*gætir 'ro teitan

E4:　　Resolution in position 1:

Eg I, 1:5	*Aðal*steinn of vann annat
Eg lv 32:8	*gaman*leikr við hal bleikan

XE3:　Resolution in position 1 (odd lines only):

　　　　HolmgB 9:7 **litar** blóði svan sveita

XE4:　Resolution in positions 1 and 2 (odd lines only):[9]

　　　　Steinunn 1:5 **munat** skíð of sjá síðan
　　　　Hfr I, 5:1　　ráð **lukusk** at sá síðan

B:　　No resolution (odd lines only).

II: Types D, A2k, C

D1:　No resolution.

D2:　Resolution in position 1 (no resolution on a nomen):

　　　　Gldr 5:8　　**hnigu** fjǫrvanir sigri

A2k:　Resolution in position 1:

　　　　Eg lv 34:5　**Arin**bjǫrn hefir árnat
　　　　Ormr 2:2　　**Ymis** blóð fara góðra

C:　　No resolution (odd lines only).

III: Type A

A^2:　　Resolution in position 1 (no resolution in even lines):

　　A1 HolmgB 4:5 **gamall** emk geira vimrar
　　A3 Þmáhl 4:7　**roðinn** sák Hrundar handa

A^3:　　Resolution in position 1:

　　A3 Þjsk I, 1:2　**hafizk** hefr runnr af gunni
　　A1 no resolution
　　A2 Hfr III, 27:5 **skiliðr** em ek við skylja
　　A3 TE 5:7　　**Haralds** hefk skarð í skildi

A^4:   Resolution in position 1 (four lines only):[10]

A2 Korm lv 9:5 *makar*as mér at mæla
    Þjóð IV, 2:1 *farið*a ér áðr fleyja
    GSúrs 26:1 *skuluð*a it kvað skorða
A3 Eyv lv 2:1 *samir*a Njǫrðr enn norðarr

A^5:   No resolution.

Less than 10 percent of the excerpted lines contain resolution and neutralization, and only 15 percent of the resolved syllables are nominal. Neutralization is most common in position 1 (Types B and C) and position 2 (A^2-A^3), usually involving a bimoric verb.[11] It seems then that neither resolution nor neutralization were consciously used as artistic devices in *dróttkvætt*; rather, both types of contractions must have been part of a licensed practice, probably to accommodate the wealth of bimoric verbs that tend to fall in the first and second positions in *dróttkvætt* lines. This is supported by the fact that neutralization is much more common in odd lines that are sentence introductory and contain verbs than in even lines (the percentages are 83 and 17, respectively), and in even lines too, resolution tends to involve verbs in position 1(45 percent). In Type E2, for example, only verbs are resolved in position 1, and in Type A2k, six lines have resolution on a nomen and twelve lines have resolution on a verb in position 1.

In Snorri's Ht 8, neutralization in odd lines in position 2 occurs on verbs (*spyr ek, muna, þorir*) and conforms to the pattern of the earliest *dróttkvætt*. The odd lines also contain resolution in position 1. All Snorri's even lines, however, are A2k-lines with no neutralization but resolution in position 1. As we have seen, neutralization is not possible in A2k-lines because they contain no proclitic particles, and this fact then accounts for the uneven number of syllables in Snorri's odd (9) and even (7) lines. In the odd lines, both rhyme and alliteration fall in position 3 (A3: *klofinn spyr ek hjalm fyrir hilmis, bila mun gramr þó at gumna, draga þorir hann yfir hreinna*) or in positions 2 and 4 (XE4:*því eru heldr þar er skekr skjǫldu*), and Snorri observed that "superfluous" syllables usually occur before the first internal rhyme (*SnE* I:610). The observation accords well with the fact that resolution in odd lines is twice as common in sentence-introductory A3-lines than in A1-lines (with alliteration in position 1), and, furthermore, owing to their syllabic structure, rhymes on bimoric words were avoided.

Many scholars have noted that resolution can occur in position 1 and not in a later position of the line (see Sievers 1878:468-69, 1893:99; Kuhn 1983:55-56, 69; Hofmann 1991:27; Kristján Árnason 1991:129), but no one has so far been able to explain the phenomenon. In A2k-lines, for example, position 1 could be filled by two resolved bimoric syllables (Ht 8:2 *hjarar egg duga seggir*), whereas neither the bimoric word in positions 3-4 (*duga*) nor the word in position 2 was contracted.

Similarly, in E2-4 and D2, the words in position 1 could be resolved, but there were no contractions in positions 2, 3-4, or 4. The same holds true for eddic lines of these types (i.e., Vsp 50:2 *hefiz lind fyrir*, Hym 11:10 *Véorr heitir sá*, Od 18:5 *vara langt af því*, Vsp 1:4 *mǫgo Heimdalar*). A look at the maximal nominal filler of these lines may help to explain this phenomenon, however.

In Type D1, positions 2-4 were occupied by the second element of a compound plus an inflectional ending (Eg lv 27:2 *landbeiðaðar reiði*). Position 4 is an enclitic ending and cannot be contracted (neutralized); position 2 is a medial syllable in a tetrasyllabic compound and cannot be resolved. In E1, positions 2-4 contain two elements of a compound joined by an enclitic in position 3 (Korm lv 4:6 *Happþægibil krapta*), in which the medial and final syllables cannot be resolved/neutralized. In Types D2 (and C) and E2 (and B), positions 3-4 are subject to the same restrictions as in D1 and E1 (Rdr 8:8 *baug ørlygis draugi*, Rdr 8:3 *til fárhuga fœra*, Rdr 1:4 *þjófs iljablað leyfa*, Haustl 2:7 *vasa Byrgitýr bjarga*). Position 1 in these lines can only be resolved if the word in position 1 is a verb, not a noun, that is, if the syntactic filler in positions 1-4 consists of the sequence v+n and not n+n (GSúrs 30:6 *munu aldrlagi valda*, Þmáhl 13:8 *liðu Hǫgna vé gǫgnum*). In types A2k and E4, too, the word in position 2 is part of a compound or a similar syntactic unit, in which the first element can be resolved (but rarely is unless it is a verb), and the second cannot. Because groups I-II of *dróttkvætt* lines, as well as eddic *fornyrðislag* lines of the same structures, follow fixed sequences of long and short syllables in positions 1-4 ($\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\breve{\times}\times$ and $\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times\breve{\times}$ and $\times\bar{\times}\breve{\times}\times$ and $\times\bar{\times}\times\breve{\times}$), and the majority of these lines are characterized by nominal fillers in positions 1-4 and 2-4, it follows that, in accordance with the restrictions imposed on contractions of inflectional endings and final/medial elements in compounds, no resolution can occur further back than position 1.

In lines of the third group (Type A), resolution on position 3 is also avoided. Such resolutions would theoretically be possible only in A3-4-lines, with a single $\bar{\times}$ in position 3 (Hást 6:7 *hjaldrs kom hríð á skjǫldu*, Korm lv 42:5 *fœrask fjǫll en stóru*). These lines have no counterparts in regular eddic lines, in which positions 2-3 are filled by a disyllabic word or similar syntactic unit (Grp 16:1 *brotin er brynia*, Reg 13:1 *kominn er hingat*, Hym 16:5 *munom at apni*). The only eddic A-lines with resolution in position 3 are the small group of lines (Vsp 6:1 *þá gengo regin ǫll*, Þrk 12:7 *við scolom aca tvau*) which Kuhn regarded as the model of eleventh-century *dróttkvætt* lines of the type *sneið fyr Sikiley víða* (Kuhn 1983:68). It would seem then, that the lack of resolution in position 3 in *dróttkvætt* A3-4-lines is the result of conventions that were taken over from alliterative poetry.

To sum up: in *dróttkvætt* lines, two short syllables could under certain circumstances occupy the position of an $\bar{\times}$ (resolution) or an $\times$ (neutralization). Such contractions are by no means common, but they occur much more frequently in odd than in even lines. They tend to occur in positions 1 and 2 in the *dróttkvætt* line and appear to have developed as a device to accommodate bimoric disyllabic

verbs, especially in sentence introduction (odd lines). Owing to the syllabic structure and the syntactic fillers in lines belonging to groups I and II, resolution was possible only in position 1, and neutralization could only occur in position 1 (Types B, C) and position 3 (Types E4, XE4). Snorri regarded resolution and neutralization as poetic license that allowed the poet to accommodate more than six syllables in the *dróttkvætt* line. Such contractions were, he writes, characterized by "quick" pronunciation, and he clearly distinguished them from the sequences of "long or short" syllables, which he regarded as constitutive of the *dróttkvætt* line (*SnE* I:594, 608-10). The conventions for resolution and neutralization were quite similar to those of eddic *fornyrðislag* (except in the C-lines discussed above), and in some cases alliterative poetry seems to have influenced the conditions in *dróttkvætt*.

Elision

The previous section shows that *dróttkvætt* lines without proclitic particles (Types D, A2k, E1-3, XE3, A¹) could not accommodate neutralization. In certain positions, however, an extra proclitic ×–syllable with a vocalic onset could be added after a vocalic enclitic ending, directly preceding the following $\bar{\times}$ (elision; Sievers 1878:473-75; Kuhn 1983:56-57, 70-72). Consider the following examples:[12]

D1:	Korm I, 6:3	fésæranda *at* fœra
	Eg lv 32:6	logbrjótanda *í* móti;
D2:	Eg lv 43:2	endr Steinari *ór* hendi;
A2k:	Korm lv 63:2	maðr þinn kona *en* svinna;
C:	Vell 3:3	fyr orþeysi *at* ausa;
A¹:	Hfr V, 19:4	varra *í* hondum svarra
	Hfr I, 4:3	ítra eina *at* láta
	HolmgB 4:7	uggik hvergi *at* hyggja;
A2:	Hfr III, 15:1	gótt es gorva *at* frétta
	Eskál II, 2:3	skyldr emk hróðri *at* halda;
A⁴:	Vell 6:3	gervi *í* holl ok hlýði.

In E-lines in which the word following the inflectional ending was an $\times$ and not an $\bar{\times}$, elision was not possible, and there are no lines of the type †*Norðmanna at gram hranna*.

Elision is most common in position 4 in even lines of Types D1-2 (50 percent), and it always involves the infinitive marker *at* (Kveld 1:6 *Þórs fangvina at ganga*), a preposition (Hfr V, 4:2 *ferr særoka at knerri*), or the definite article *enn* (Korm lv 39:2 *trauðr sæfara enn blauði*). In C-lines, elision in position 4 is much rarer (2

lines only), and Kuhn (1983:71) speculates that this is because position 3 in such lines always carried full stress. It is not clear why a full stress on the preceding syllable should preclude elision (cf. elisions in A-lines and A2k-lines and Kuhn's distribution of stresses); rather, the lack of elision in Type C must be caused by the syntactic filler of these lines: they are either sentence introductory and contain the sequence n+n (usually a syntactic unit: Rdr 19:3 *hinns mætygil máva*) or n+v (Haustl 12:5 *ok lómhugaðr lagði*) in positions 2-6, or they can be introduced by a preposition (line 3), in which case positions 2-6 are usually filled by a nominal phrase (Rdr 17:3 *á haussprengi Hrungnis*).[13] None of these syntactic fillers can readily accommodate a prepositional phrase or an infinitive with *at* in positions 4-6, and the two lines that do contain elision (GSúrs 12:1 *luku þungliga á þingi*, Vell 3:3 *fyr qrþeysi at ausa*) are quite unusual. In Type D-lines, however, there were no such restrictions. It is not clear which of the two vowels were elided, but, in view of the fact that all elisions occur in lines that can accommodate enclitic inflectional endings but no proclitic formwords (Eg lv 5:2 *láðvarðaðar garði* but not †*láðvarðaðr í garði*), it seems most likely that the second vowel was elided during recitation (see also Kuhn 1983:71).

Elision then allowed the insertion of an extra, proclitic syllable in lines that usually could not accommodate a proclitic formword, but it was by no means a frequently used devise (28 lines only), and it was favored by a small group of skalds, namely Kormákr (6 lines), Hallfreðr (6 lines), Egill (5 lines), Einarr skálaglamm (5 lines), Bersi (5 lines), Kveldulfr (1 line) and Gísli (1 line).

Syllabification of Compounds and Phonetic Cohesion

We have seen that the sequence ŠŠŠ was strictly avoided in *dróttkvætt* lines and that, with the exception of a small group of lines with resolution (*sneið fyr Sikiley víða*), there are no syllabic fillers like †*gunnr Haraldi sunnan*. Apparent violations of this principle can be obviated by the introduction of an earlier formative -*j*- / -*v*-element (Rdr 13:7 *fyr *vinjeyjar víðri*, Rdr 2:4 *mǫgr *Sigvarðar Hǫgna*). In lines like Eyv lv 1:8 *fljótt her-sǫgu dróttni*, Korm lv 39:2 *trauðr sæ-fara enn blauði*, and GSúrs 14:6 *bjargs ó-lifat marga*, the morphemic boundaries are redefined and the consonantal onset of the second syllable becomes the offset of the first syllable, making that syllable long (*hers-ǫgu, sæf-ara, ól-ifat*; Gade 1991:371; Kristján Árnason 1991:170). The same process is reflected in such internal rhymes as Glúmr lv 1:4 *framl-igt Haraldr Gaml-a*, Korm lv 33:8 *Eyst-eins sonum leyst-an*, Þjóð IV, 2:4 *Gór-ǫðr of sjá stór-an*, and Þmáhl 4:4 *ǫrl-eiks frá því gǫrl-a* (see Kuhn 1983:78). Inflectional -*r* and -*s* did not count as morae in position 4 (group I), and words like *marr* (Korm lv 24:6 *Hringeir at marr spryngi*), *gramr* (Vell 24:2 *víðfrægt en gramr síðan*), and *vinr* (Haustl 4:4 *hrafnásar vinr blása*) were treated as bimoric in that position. In other positions of the line, however, these

inflectional endings, as well as inflectional -*t* and the encliticized -*k* (< *ek*), -*t* (< *at*), -*s* (< *es*), clearly serve to make a bimoric syllable long. Consider the following examples:

Rdr 14:2	*sonr* aldafǫðrs vildi
Haustl 20:4	*ryðs* hœlibǫl gœli
Hást 5:2	*ák* þunnan hjǫr Gunnar
Haustl 3:5	marg*spakr* of nam mæla
Eg lv 4:6	odd*skýs* fyr þér nýsa
Hfr V, 18:2	*kveðk* enn of hlut þenna
Haustl 3:6	*már* valkastar báru
Glúmr lv 1:2	*hjǫrs* berdraugar fjǫrvi
Korm lv 41:8	*lák* andvana banda
GSúrs 33:4	hræ*nets* regin setja
Vell 20:8	Yggs *niðr* friðar biðja
Eg lv 12:3	*Hǫðr* á hauki troðnum
Rdr 13:3	*svát* af rennirauknum
Þmáhl 13:5	*þás* á fyrða fundi
Korm lv 26:1	*hefk* á holm of gengit
Rdr 11:5	allr gekk *herr* und hurðir
Glúmr I, 1:1	brandr fær *logs* ok landa
Sindr 8:5	gerra *gramr* í snerru
Korm lv 56:1	vísu *munk* of vinna
Haustl 20:3	Reiði*týs* et rauða
Vell 28:3	gengi*ligt* at ganga.

In some cases, however, a bimoric word without an inflectional or contractional consonant can occupy the position of a long syllable ($\bar{\times}$), as in the lines GSúrs 30:4 *hjǫr gellanda bella*, Haustl 7:6 *reimuð Jǫtunheima*, and Haustl 8:1 *fló með fróðgum tívi*. Because internal rhymes are occasionally carried across the morphemic boundaries of two separate words (e.g., Eg lv 33:3 *af-þvít eggjar deyfði*), Kristján Árnason (1991:170-72) argues that so-called light syllables could fill strong positions in *dróttkvætt* lines if they become heavy by force of cohesion, that is, if the consonantal onset of the following syllable served to make it long, as in the compounds above (*hers-ǫgu*, etc.). While this observation certainly seems to hold true for the majority of the lines in which bimoric syllables occupy an $\bar{\times}$-position, the picture is by no means as clear as Kristján paints it. First of all, there are instances where unprotected bimoric syllables do occupy his strong positions, as in Hfr V, 26:6 *mjǫk emk vátr af nǫkkvi*, ÞHjalt 2:5 *þat eitt lifir þeira*, and Hfr III, 14:4 *blóð kom á þrǫm þíðan*.[14] But there is a strong tendency for syllables with the vocalic stems -*ey*, -*æ* to occur in such positions, that is, those syllables with an earlier syncopated glide that can form internal rhymes with -*eyj*- / -*æv*-, as in Korm

lv 25:6 *geirþey of mey heyja*, Hfr II, 4:8 *geirþey á Skáneyju*, Eg lv 28:4 *mey ørlygi at heyja*, and Eg lv 1:3 *fley ok fagrar árar*. Second, the distribution of syllables protected by an enclitic inflectional/contractional consonant and the syllables protected by cohesion across morphemic boundaries can be summarized as follows:

(1) Bimoric syllables protected by an enclitic consonant are much more common in an x̄-position than bimoric syllables protected by cohesion (63 percent vs. 37 percent).

(2) In even lines of Type D2 (position 1: HolmgB 2:8 *Freyr einvígi heyja*), Types A2k/E4 (position 2: Haustl 4:6 *vígfrekr ofan sígask*, Gldr 6:2 *gunnmás fyr haf sunnan*), Type A² (position 1: Hfr III, 16:4 *glaðr ok báða Naðra*), and in odd and even lines of Type A⁵ (position 3: Haustl 20:3 *Reiðitýs et rauða*, Rdr 10:2 *landa vanr á sandi*) protection by an enclitic consonant is the rule, and cohesion is almost nonexistent.

(3) Cohesion rarely occurs across sentence boundaries, but syllables protected by an enclitic consonant often occur directly before a sentence boundary. The proportions are 17 percent:83 percent.

(4) Cohesion is characteristic of sentence-introductory lines (92 percent of all such instances), protection by enclitic consonants is not (47 percent in sentence introduction).

The main differences between between the two categories can be illustrated by even lines of Type A³:

(1) Protection by enclitic consonant		(2) Cohesion	
(a) No sentence break after the cohesive, protected syllable		(a) No sentence break between the syllables	
Eg lv 19:6	**Freyr** ok Njǫrðr af jǫrðum	Hildr 1:2	*nú* rekið gand ór landi
Korm lv 6:8	**hagr** sem drengr enn fagri	TE 3:6	*þar* fló grár at sárum
Korm lv 42:2	**hvatt** sem korn á vatni	Eg lv 19:2	*gram* reki bǫnd af lǫndum
Hfr III, 24:4	**sumr** eða brott of kumnum	Eyv lv 12:2	*svá* hǫfum inn sem Finnar
Hfr V, 9:4	**gramr** ok Þórr enn rammi	Tjǫrvi 1:2	*þat* vas sétt við glettu
Hfr V, 25:4	**gramr** ok jarl of framðan	Vell 22:4	*fǫr* til Sogns of gǫrva
Rdr 8:6	hals en **bǫls** of fyllda	Bbreiðv 1:6	*ek* tegumk sjalfr at drekka
Eg lv 36:8	horns / til **dags** at morni	ÓTr 1:2	*ek* fekk dreng til strengjar
Gunnh 1:4	bǫrð / es **gramr** hefr Fjǫrðu	Hfr V, 2:6	*svá* geta menn til hennar
Korm I, 6:8	fens / vá **gramr** til menja	Haustl 6:2	svangr / vas *þat* fyr lǫngu

Korm lv 15:2	sunds erum **hugr** á Gunni	Þjóð IV, 2:8	veðr / nús **brim** *f*yr Jaðri
Þþyn 1:2	hræs / es **kømr** at sævi	TE 4:6	þeir / áðr **mik** *h*afi felldan
GSúrs 14:8	vetr / nús **skamt** til betra	Korm lv 35:6	skorð man **ek** *f*yr norðan
Leiknir 1:4	elds / nús **skart** á þellu	Oddr 1:6	sætt vasat **gǫr** *m*eð létta
Eskál IV, 1:2	vǫrð / þanns **sitr** at jǫrðu	Gríss 1:4	sveimr / meðan **ek** *v*as heiman
Bbreiðv 1:2	viðar ok **blás** í miðli		
Hfr III, 20:6	sárr mun **gramr** at hváru		
TE 3:6	þar fló **grár** at sárum.		

<div style="text-align:center">

(b) Sentence boundary after the
protected syllable:

(b) Cohesion across sentence
boundary:

</div>

Eg lv 44:4	**borr** / en hlust es þorrin	Eg lv 3:8	**ǫl** / **þ**ats Bárðr of signdi.
Korm I, 6:8	**fens** / vá gramr til menja		
Holmg B 2:4	**glaðr** / emk reyndr at ǫðru		
Þþyn 1:2	**hræs** / es kømr at sævi		
Þjsk IV, 2:4	**mens** / tók sverð at grenja		
Hfr III, 3:8	**siðr** / ok jarl enn þriðja		
Hfr V, 10:2	**siðr** / at blót eru kviðjuð		

Thus syllabic cohesion depends very much on syntactic cohesion, and a syntactic break in the form of a sentence boundary tends to be preceded by either a trimoric[+] syllable or a syllable with an enclitic inflectional/contractional consonant. Syllabic cohesion and redefinition of morphemic boundaries occur regularly in such syntactic units as compounds, but cohesion also occurs between separate morphological entities in sentence-introductory lines and is generally avoided across a sentence boundary. That circumstance accords badly with Kuhn's law of the caesura, which places syntactic breaks between the two elements of compounds (Rdr 13:3 *svát af renni-* | *rauknum*) and whose formulation was prompted by the structure of A1²-lines (cf. above, pp. 52-54).

If syllabic cohesion is in any way related to the phonetic realization of the lines, which seems to be the logical conclusion, sentence boundaries must have been marked during recitation, and lines containing such breaks must have been recited differently from those lines (and those parts of the lines) in which such breaks were absent.[15] The A³-lines above show that lines belonging to one type or subgroup may or may not contain a sentence break (Korm I, 6:8 *fens / vá gramr til menja*, Hfr V, 2:6 *svá geta menn til hennar*) and, judging from their clause function, lines with syllabic cohesion across a morphemic boundary are far more likely to have a sentence-introductory function than, for example, a sentence-concluding function. This corresponds very closely to the conditions under which resolution operates,

and the possible implications of these observations will be examined more closely in Chapter 8.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I have attempted to establish certain parameters for the discussion of syntactic fillers in Chapters 4-6. It is clear, for instance, that Kuhn's law of the caesura cannot be applied unconditionally to *dróttkvætt* lines, and that both his placement of syntactic caesuras and his contention that all lines contain syntactic breaks are often contradicted by the syntactic structure of the lines themselves. It is impossible to ascertain exactly what constitutes a syntactic break in *dróttkvætt* stanzas, but I suggested that, although this poetic genre could have followed syntactic rules resulting from formal restrictions, it is unlikely that the fundamental syntactic conventions could have differed very much from those of prose. Furthermore, the distribution of syllabic cohesion and bimoric syllables protected by enclitic consonants seems to indicate that sentence boundaries were marked during recitation, and sentence-introductory lines show a greater measure of syntactic cohesion (and resolution) than lines with other clause functions. That circumstance may be taken to mean that marked syntactic breaks (i.e., sentence boundaries) were avoided in sentence introduction, and this possibility will be explored in the next chapters.

Resolution, neutralization, and elision were all part of a system of poetic license that allowed the poets to accommodate more than six syllables in *dróttkvætt* lines. Snorri, who does not mention elision, assigns both resolution and neutralization to the phonetic level of performance: according to him, such contracted syllables were pronounced "quickly," and they were not to be confused with the sequences of long and short, hard and soft syllables which he regarded as constitutive of regular *dróttkvætt* lines (i.e., our sequences of $\bar{\times}$, $\breve{\times}$, and ×). Neither neutralization nor resolution, which was restricted to certain positions because of the syntactic filler of the lines, was very common, and both devices probably originated as a way to make room for the number of bimoric disyllabic verbs in positions 1-2 in sentence-introductory lines. Elision is most common in position 4 of lines belonging to group I. It was favored by a small group of poets and, if not consciously employed, it was certainly one of the trademarks of those poets' individual style.

Unlike resolution and neutralization, which the poets apparently resorted to whenever needed, the long enclitic syllables in ×-positions in A-lines seem to have been used for emphatic purposes. Just as in their eddic counterpart (*sceggǫld, scálmǫld*), *skjalfhent* lines and A1-lines with a long enclitic in position 4 occur at moments of heightened tension, and Jórunn's imitation of Goþþormr's "heavy dips" shows that the skalds must have been keenly aware of this artistic device.

The discussion above shows that *dróttkvætt* lines have much in common with eddic *fornyrðislag*. With the exception of eddic even Type C-lines (HH I, 34:8 *at Gnipalundi*, etc.), which seem to have served their own artistic purpose, the distribution of resolution and neutralization follows more or less the same patterns. Sometimes influence from *fornyrðislag* can be traced in certain developments in *dróttkvætt* (e.g., in the lack of resolution in position 3, A-lines; in eleventh-century lines like *sneið fyr Sikiley víða*; and possibly in the creation of the rhetorically emphatic *skjalfhent*).

The following three chapters contain an exhaustive discussion of the peculiarities of each type of syntactic filler in odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines, and, while making the pertinent comparisons with *fornyrðislag*-lines, I examine the syllabic and syntactic structure of the lines with special attention to the placement of sentence boundaries, clause function, and the relations between syntax, alliteration, and placement of internal rhymes. Many of the observations on the types of fillers will corroborate Kuhn's findings (see especially 1983:133-214), but the present investigation is fuller and sheds new light on such controversial issues as word order, composition and comprehension of *dróttkvætt* stanzas, structural differences between odd and even lines, stylistic peculiarities of *lausavísur* and panegyrics, and relations between *dróttkvætt* and alliterative poetry. In that respect, my discussions stand as a complement and corrective to Kuhn's work. The detailed discussions of syntactic fillers can also serve as a reference for future analyses of *dróttkvætt* and alliterative poetry, and may be of use for determining dates and authorial provenance of *dróttkvætt* stanzas.

Group I: Types E1-4, XE3-4, and B

Type E1 Even: (2 lines)   *E1*: ⫽x̄x×x̆ox

Korm lv 4:6	Happþægibil krapta
Korm lv 7:6	Hǫrbeiðisif greiðir.

There are only two lines of Type E1, with a tetrasyllabic compound in positions 1-4. Both are even lines, and both are from Kormákr's *lausavísur*. The compounds are part of *kenningar* for women referring to Steingerðr, and the internal rhyme falls in position 1 or 2. The E1-lines are either sentence concluding (lv 7:6) or sentence continuing (lv 4:6).[1] There are no sentence boundaries in these lines, and the type has no counterpart in *fornyrðislag* lines, in which no tetrasyllabic compound of the form $\overline{S}S S\breve{S}$ occupies the whole half-line.

Type E2 Even: (18 lines)   *E2*: ⫽x̄x×x̆ox

Rdr 1:4	þjófs iljablað leyfa
Rdr 14:2	sonr aldafǫðrs vildi
Haustl 13:6	Finns iljabrú minni
Haustl 20:4	ryðs hœlibǫl gœli
Eg lv 35:4	þinn kinnalá minni
VGl 7:2	víns Hirðisíf mínum
Vell 2:4	bergs geymilá dverga
Bbreiðv 2:6	valdr Geymibil falda
Tindr II, 1:4	viðr halfan tøg þriðja.

This type is characterized by the sequence n+n+n/v, in which the second nomen is a trisyllabic compound or similar syntactic unit of the syllabic form $\overline{S}S\breve{S}$.[2] The word(s) in positions 2-3 can be part of a nominal phrase that covers positions 2-6 (*kinnalá minni, Geymibil falda, halfan tøg þriðja, halfan tøg fjorða, eina Gná steina, þenna dag lengstan*) or positions 1-4 (*þjófs iljablað [leyfa], sonr aldafǫðrs [vildi], ryðs hœlibǫl [gœli], víns Hirðisíf [mínum], þinn góðan byr [finna]*). In the latter case, the word in positions 5-6 is usually a verb, and the nominal phrase in positions 1-4 is an immediate constituent, either the subject or the direct object.

Sometimes the whole line consists of a nominal phrase: *Finns iljabrú minni, bergs geymilá dverga*. The type occurs from the earliest *dróttkvætt* onward, and six out of seventeen lines are from encomiastic poetry.

Thirteen lines are sentence concluding and four are continuing. All the words in position 1 are either long or protected by an enclitic consonant (*sonr, ryðs, viðr*). Two lines contain a hard sentence boundary after position 4, and both are sentence concluding: HolmgB 11:4 *morð / halfan tøg fjorða*, Bbreiðv 1:4 *strengs / þenna dag lengstan*. The internal rhymes fall in positions 1 (13 lines) or 2 (5 lines), and the distribution is closely connected with the syntactic structure of the lines: if there is no sentence boundary after position 1, the internal rhyme may fall in position 2: *sonr aldafǫðrs vildi, ryðs hælibǫl gæli*. If there is a sentence boundary after position 1, however, the internal rhyme must fall in position 1.

It is not immediately clear why there are no odd E2-lines like †*sonr aldafǫðrs seldi*. The absence of such odd lines seems to be due to restrictions imposed by alliteration in positions 1 and 5, as well as to the semantic properties of the compounds in positions 2-4 (see Chap. 5, pp. 107-09). In even lines, with alliteration in position 1 only, these restrictions did not apply.

To sum up: There are no odd E2-lines, most likely because of requirements imposed by alliteration in position 5. Even E2-lines have strong syntactic cohesion between positions 2-4 and 5-6 (syntactic units), and sentence boundaries fall after position 1 (2 lines). These hard sentence boundaries are marked by rhyme, alliteration, and syllabic length (always protected) on one side of the caesura, and there is no syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2. The pattern is predominantly sentence concluding and has no counterpart in eddic lines.

Type E2 Verbal Even: (15 lines)   E2: //x̄xx̆ox

VGl 6:2	mun sverðabrak verða
Skall 3:2	ák sveigar kǫr deiga
Hást 5:2	ák þunnan hjǫr Gunnar
Hfr V, 5:4	nú ák Sýrar mey dýra
Korm lv 25:4	varð þeira hlutr meiri
Þmáhl 17:6	sék þeira lið meira
Skall 3:8	þat v's inga gjǫf / hingat
Eg lv 20:6	greypts hennar skap / þenna
Vell 20:2	hraut unda fjǫl / Þundar
Vell 32:4	hlaut Óðinn val / Fróða.

This subgroup of Type E2 has a verb instead of a nomen (pronoun) in position 1, and twelve out of fifteen lines are sentence introductory. Unlike nominal E2-lines, lines with a verb in position 1 have no sentence boundaries after that position, but four lines have a sentence boundary after position 4 and an

independent parenthetic statement in positions 1-4 (Skall 3:8 *þat v's inga gjǫf*, Eg lv 20:6 *greypts hennar skap*, Vell 20:2 *hraut unda fjǫl*, Vell 32:4 *hlaut Óðinn val*). Position 1 can be resolved (*bitu, liðu, nú ák*), and, with one exception (Korm lv 9:2), the internal rhymes occupy position 2, not position 1 as in the regular E2-lines. Only three lines belong to panegyrics (Vell 20:2, 32:2, 32:4), and semantically the lines are characterized by their brief exclamatory content: from his subjective point of view, the skald comments boisterously on the situation described in the *helmingr* or, as in one instance, issues a direct command to his antagonist (Korm lv 9:2 *ljóst vendi mar Tósti*). Seven out of fifteen lines come from the poetry of Egill Skalla-Grímsson and the skalds surrounding him (Skall 3:2, 3:8; Eg 20:6, 23:6; Vell 20:2, 32:2, 32:4), and that number is too high to be fortuitous.

Owing to the same restrictions as in nominal E2-lines, there are no odd lines of Type E2 Verbal. The words in positions 2-4 are parts of a nominal phrase (except Vell 32:4), and in only a few cases is the word in positions 5-6 part of that phrase: Skall 3:2 *ák sveigar kǫr deiga*, TE 3:4 *bitu þengils son ungan*, Hást 5:2 *ák þunnan hjǫr Gunnar*, Þmáhl 13:8 *liðu Hǫgna vé gǫgnum*, Hfr V, 5:4 *nú ák Sýrar mey dýra*. The only eddic example from this category is the imperative line Hlr 14:8 *søcstu, gýgiarkyn*.

Type E3 Odd: (153 lines)   *E3:* //⊻×⊻//×

Haustl 4:1	fjallgylðir bað fyllar
Haustl 18:1	fjǫrspillir lét falla
Eg lv 9:3	þingharðan frák þengil
Eyv lv 10:1	einn dróttin hefk áttan
Þmáhl 8:3	kunnfáka hné kennir
Vell 12:1	hjalmgrápi vann hilmir
Vell 17:3	veðrgœðis stendr víða
Hfr I, 3:1	sannyrðum spenr sverða
Eg lv 32:3	ulfgrennir / hefr unnit
Eg lv 10:3	þreklundaðr fell / Þundar.

The filler of Type E3 Odd consists of a trisyllabic compound of the form $\overline{\overline{SSS}}$ in positions 1-3 followed by a verb and an element that is usually a constituent of the verb (infinitive, participle II, adverb, subject, object).[3] The first internal rhyme can fall in position 1 or 2; the placement seems to unrelated to the syntactic structure of the lines (see Kuhn 1983:148). Position 4 is always occupied by a verb (Craigie's law), and the reason for this is clear: as in E1 and E2, position 5 alliterates, and no nonalliterating nomen can directly precede (be proclitic to) the alliterating word in the cadence.[4] This then explains Craigie's observations about the different lexico-grammatical fillers of position 4 in odd and even lines of this type.

The pattern is predominantly sentence introductory (146 lines), and only nine lines contain sentence boundaries:

Eg lv 10:3	þreklundaðr fell / Þundar
Eg lv 14:1	ókynni vensk / ennis
Eg lv 35:7	Ármóði liggr / œðri
HolmgB 2:5	randlauki klaufk / randa
HolmgB 7:5	torogætir 'ro / teitan
Hallbj 1:1	ǫlkarma lætr / arma
Vell 29:3	arngreddir varð / odda
Eg lv 22:3	Blóðøxar / rauðk blóði
Eg lv 32:3	ulfgrennir / hefr unnit.

The two lines with a sentence boundary after position 3 are not sentence introductory but continuing or concluding. According to Kuhn (1983:149), odd lines of our Type E3 (his Types E[1-2]) always contain a syntactic caesura after position 4, and at first sight the seven lines above with a sentence boundary after position 4 might seem to corroborate his statement. However, most odd E3-lines contain no break in syntax, and, of the lines above with sentence breaks after position 4 (and 3), four out of nine belong to the poetry of Egill Skalla-Grímsson, and two to the poetry of Bersi. It is likely therefore that we are dealing with characteristics of style rather than with a general trend, and sentence boundaries appear to have been consciously avoided in sentence-introductory odd E3-lines.

Because the verbs in our E3-lines fall in position 4 and position 3 is occupied by an enclitic inflectional ending, Kuhn declared these lines in violation of his law of sentence particles (Kuhn 1933:58-59, 1983:201). As he assigns full stress to the verbs in position 4, however, it is not clear how they could violate that law: sentence particles are, by definition, words with low or no stress; if verbs receive full stress, they are no longer sentence particles. In our notation, position 4 is filled by a word belonging to the lexico-grammatical category $\breve{\times}$, and we have seen that a formword (preposition, particle) could never occupy that position. It would appear then, that the conditions described by Kuhn's law of sentence particles relate to words that occupy ×-positions and not to words that occupy $\breve{\times}$-positions. If that is the case, the law of sentence particles would only apply to lines of Types B and C (position 1), E4 (position 3), and Type A (positions 2 and 4). Sentence-introductory E3-lines, however, are verb second, a word order we should expect from the syntax of prose. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that, if there is a sentence boundary in such introductory lines, it falls after the verb and not before. That circumstance could indicate that the verb, being the core functional unit in a clause, must occur before syntactic disruption could take place. That possibility is explored in the later sections of this and subsequent chapters.

The syntax of sentence-introductory E3-lines is uncomplicated. The subject or part of the subject occurs in positions 1-3 immediately preceding the verb (Gldr 8:1 *menfergir bar margar*: 63 lines), in positions 5-6 immediately following the verb (Eg lv 28:7 *alfeigum skýtr ægir*: 12 lines), or in the following even line, usually in initial position (Eyv lv 6:3-4 *malmhríðar svall meiðum // móðr /*: 16 lines). In forty-three lines, the subject is the enclitic *-k* (< *ek*) appended to the verb, or the verb is part of an impersonal construction or in the imperative: Korm lv 8:7 *Sólgunni metk svinna*, Eg lv 19:5 *folkmýgi lát flýja*, Korm lv 22:7 *þrimr aurum skal þetta*. Encliticized subjects are typical of the subject-related *lausavísur*, which are centered around the skald and his experience. Consider the following examples from Kormákr's *lausavísur*:

Korm lv 1:7	alls ekki *veitk* ella
Korm lv 6:1	svǫrt augu *berk* sága
Korm lv 7:1	Qlságu *metk* auga
Korm lv 8:7	Sólgunni *metk* svinna
Korm lv 10:3	grepps reiðu *mank* góða
Korm lv 17:5	því meira *skalk* þeiri
Korm lv 33:5	naddhríðar *skalk* níða.

Conversely, encliticized subjects are rare in encomiastic poetry and only occur in certain stereotyped statements like "bid for a hearing" (Vell 1:1 *hugstóran biðk heyra*), "plea for reward" (Korm I, 7:1 *algildan biðk aldar*), "poetic boast" (Húsdr 1:1 *hjaldrgegnis ték Hildar*), or "affirmation of hearsay" (Hfr II, 4:7 *gollskerði frák gerðu*).

A small group of *helmingar* has subjects that occur later than in line 2 (12 lines). Most of these half-stanzas are parts of longer panegyrics (8 lines), and in eight out of twelve lines the subject or part of the subject is introduced in positions 1-3 in an odd A2^5-line:

Sindr 6:1	valþagnar lét vegnum ‖ - ‖ *handar vafs* (*gildir*)
Gráf 2:1	dolgeisu rak dísar ‖ - ‖ *gumna vinr*
Gráf 8:1	heinþýntan lét hvína ‖ - ‖ *foldar vǫrðr*
Vell 32:1	valfǫllum hlóð vǫllu ‖ - ‖ *hríðar áss*
Hfr I, 1:1	askþollum stendr Ullar ‖ - ‖ *rækilundr*
Hfr II, 5:1	bǫðserkjar hjó birki ‖ - ‖ *hleypimeiðr*
Oddr 1:5	snarráðan kom síðan ‖ - ‖ *Forna sjóðs* (*farmr*)
Eg lv 14:1	ókynni vensk / ennis ‖ - ‖ *haukaklifs* (*Hlín*).

Thus the syntax in sentence-introductory E3-lines is to a great extent predictable. The subject occurs in close proximity to the verb (either positions 1-3 or 5-6, initially in the subsequent line, or as an enclitic to the verb), or, in more

elaborate panegyrics, it can be suspended to a later line (usually to positions 1-3 in the third line). Sometimes parts of the subject (attributive genitives and adjectives) occupy these positions, but a listener familiar with the conventional placement of the subjects in sentence-introductory E3-lines would have had little difficulty identifying the incomplete phrases as parts of the subject. Consider the following examples:

Hfr I, 7:1	*grams rúni* lætr glymja
Húsdr 3:1	*þjokkvaxinn* kvezk þykkja ‖ *þiklingr*
GSúrs 22:5	*mágrundar* kvazk mundu ‖ - ‖ *Hneigisól* /
Gráf 3:5	sliðrtungur lét syngva ‖ *sverðleiks reginn* /.

We can see from this discussion that Type E3 Odd is a sentence-introductory pattern and that, owing to restrictions imposed by alliteration, no nomen could occupy the position directly before the alliterating stave in position 5 (see Craigie's law). The word order in these lines is straightforward (verb second), with the subject or parts of the subject occurring in close proximity to the verb and in predictable positions. There is usually a strong syntactic cohesion between the words in positions 4 and 5-6, and only a small group of lines (most of which come from Egill's poetry) contains a sentence boundary after position 4. It seems that in sentence-introductory lines of this type, syntactic disruption must occur after the finite verb, whereas in sentence-concluding lines (Eg lv 32:3 *ulfgrennir* / *hefr unnit*) or continuing lines (Eg lv 22:3 *Blóðøxar* / *rauðk blóði*) that need not be the case.[5] It also became clear that there is a distinct difference between the syntactic fillers of *lausavísur* and encomiastic poems: in *lausavísur* encliticized subjects in position 4 are quite common, whereas in panegyrics they tend to be avoided and occur only in stereotyped statements in which the skald imparts his subjective comments. There are no odd E3-lines in "Ragnarsdrápa," and the first occur in Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng." This type of introductory line was especially favored by Egill (24 lines), Goþþormr Sindri (10 lines), and Einarr skálaglamm (20 lines).

The syntactic fillers of odd E3-lines in *fornyrðislag* meter were not subject to the same restrictions of alliteration (position 5) as in *dróttkvætt* lines, and position 4 is usually occupied by a nomen:

Vsp 6:3	ginnheilog goð
Vsp 14:7	Aurvanga siǫt
HH I, 24:5	langhǫfðuð scip
HH I, 35:3	flugtrauðan gram
HHj 35:7	Sigrlinnar sonr
HH II, 50:3	Sigmundar burr
Gǫr II, 21:7	svalkǫldom sæ.

In such cases the lines are sentence continuing rather than introductory, and alliteration can occur in positions 1 and 4. If the word in position 4 is a finite verb, the line is sentence introductory and position 4 never alliterates (but position 2 may), and the placement of the subject corresponds to that of *dróttkvætt* lines:

Vsp 32:5	**Baldrs bróðir** var
Hym 39:1	**þróttǫflugr** kom
HH I, 27:5, 7	eisandi gecc ‖ - ‖ **lofðungs floti**
HH I, 33:1	**Sinfiǫtli** qvað
HH I, 42:3	gullbitluð, **vart**
Sg 47:5	gullbrynio smó (impersonal).

Type E3 Even: (195 lines)   E3: $\not{l}\!/\widecheck{\text{\reflectbox{x}}}\times\times\widecheck{\text{x}}\text{ox}$

Eyv lv 13:2	lǫgsóta verfótum
GSúrs 5:2	hvarmskógi Gná bógar
Vell 16:8	óhryggva vé byggva
Rdr 11:4	fordæða nam ráða
Haustl 15:6	hógreiðar framm drógu
Hfr V, 2:8	Kolfinnu mér rinna
GSúrs 3:4	sárteina / Vésteini
Eg lv 24:2	angrbeittan veg langan
Eyv lv 2:4	borðmœrar skæ fœra
Eg V, 1:4	hoddsendis boð / enda.

The filler of the first three positions in even E3-lines is similar to that of odd lines, both in terms of syllabic structure and placement of internal rhymes (positions 1 or 2), but because there is no alliteration in position 5, there are no restrictions on the filler of position 4, except that formwords and trimoric[+] nomina are excluded. There is usually a strong syntactic cohesion between the words in positions 4 and 5-6 (i.e., positions 1-3 and positions 4-6), and these positions can be filled by a nominal phrase (Hfr III, 10:4 *folkreifum Áleifi*, Hfr II, 6:4 *ljótvaxinn hræ Saxa*) or by a verbal phrase (Þdís I, 2:6 *Hyrrokkin dó fyrri*, Þjsk II, 1:4 *Englandi rauð branda*, Eskál IV, 3:4 *sárelda spor váru*, Vell 11:6 *haffaxa lét vaxa*).[6] In other and rarer cases, however, the syntactic configuration appears to be positions 1-4 and 5-6, as in Haustl 5:2 *Fárbauta mǫg Váru*, Eyv lv 4:8 *Norðmanna gram hranna*. These syntactic configurations correspond exactly to the distribution of sentence boundaries as depicted below:

Sentence boundary after position 3 (21 lines)		*Sentence boundary after position 4* (12 lines)	
Eg lv 13:8	armsíma / mér grímu	Eg V, 1:4	hoddsendis boð / enda
Gráf 5:4	brennanda / sák renna	Eg lv 2:2	sumbleklu þér / kumbla
Gráf 13:4	íþróttir / framm sótti	Eg lv 2:4	bragðvísan þik / dísir
Korm lv 4:2	líðs hyrjar / því stríði	Eg lv 31:6	fleindǫggvar stafr / hǫggum
Korm lv 35:4	vellauðigr / mér dauða	Eg lv 41:4	mjaðveitar dag / leita
Korm lv 44:2	dagtála / því máli	Eg lv 45:4	hnitvǫllum mér / sitja
GSúrs 3:4	sárteina / Vésteini	Gráf 7:2	Malmóðinn sá / blóði
GSúrs 9:8	Sǫrfreyja / ver deyja	Korm lv 39:4	ógǫrva þat / sǫrva
GSúrs 22:8	hornflœðar / mik grœða	GSúrs 16:8	handlausum tý / granda
GSúrs 32:2	benvíðis / mér síður	Þmáhl 5:2	Hjǫrnirðir mik / fjǫrvi
Þmáhl 3:8	nágrundar / Vermundi	Húsdr 1:4	geðfjarðar lá / kveðja.
Þmáhl 9:4	ylgteiti / vel beita		
Vell 18:4	geirbríkar / frið slíkan		
Vell 28:4	geirrásar / her þeira		
Vell 31:4	hjǫrlautar / kom Sǫrla		
Bbreiðv 3:8	gjalfrelda / mér sjǫlfum		
Þjsk I, 1:4	Folkránar / þér mána		
Ormr 1:4	vagnbrautar / mér fagnar		
Þdís II, 1:4	hoddsviptir / fekk giptu		
Hfr III, 23:4	landherðar / skǫp verða		
Hfr V, 28:8	helvíti / skal slíta		

We see, then, that even E3-lines allowed the syntactic structure *Happþægi / bil / krapta*, as well as *Happþægi / bilkrapta*, (see Chap. 2, pp. 49-50), but the latter is much more common. The lines with sentence boundary after position 4 are largely from Egill's poetry (6 out of 11 lines), and we may conclude that syntactic breaks after position 4 in odd and even E3-lines is characteristic of Egill's style. It is interesting that this feature occurs in stanzas that scholars have deemed spurious (e.g., lv 10 and 31), as well as in those that are generally regarded as genuine (e.g., Eg V, lv 41 and 45).[7]

Only four of the 195 even E3-lines are sentence introductory, namely Eyv lv 10:6 *tveim skjǫldum lékk aldri*, GSúrs 16:8 *handlausum tý / granda*, Þdís I, 2:2 *Kjallandi brauzt alla*, and Þdís I, 2:6 *Hyrrokkin dó fyrri*. As should be expected, they all have a finite verb in position 4, and the only sentence boundary falls after position 4 (GSúrs lv 16:8), which corroborates the observations from the previous section concerning the placement of sentence boundaries in sentence-introductory lines. Fifty-eight of the remaining even lines are sentence continuing, but the overwhelming majority of such lines are sentence concluding, often with a verbal phrase in positions 4-6 or 5-6.

If positions 4-6 are occupied by a nominal phrase, the order of constituents is regularly base word plus qualifier (BW+Q) and not qualifier plus base word (Q+BW), as in positions 1-3:

Eg lv 21:4	fjarðǫlna *hlut skarðan*
Korm I, 1:2	sannreynis *fen tanna*
Korm lv 34:8	linnbeðjar *Gná sinni*
Hást 4:8	griðbítum *frið lítinn*
GSúrs 5:2	hvarmskógi *Gná bógar*.

Only a pronominal adjective as qualifier can occur in proclitic position, as in Gráf 9:8 *orðheppinn því morði*, Korm lv 4:2 *líðs hyrjar / því stríði*, and Korm lv 44:2 *dagtála / því máli*. According to Kuhn (1933:71), that order of constituents was due to the fact that, in a syntactic unit of the form *frið lítinn*, the word in the cadence was stressed more strongly than the word in position 4: hence the expected order Q+BW (ń+n) was no longer possible and the result was the sequence BW+Q. As we have seen, the restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd lines (the filler of position 4) do not apply to even lines, and the order of elements in positions 4-6 in even lines may indeed owe a lot to the lack of alliteration further back than position 1. In odd XE-lines with alliteration in positions 4 and 5, however, we find exactly the same order of consituents as in even lines (Korm lv 5:7 *þat skyldak kyn kvinna*, HolmgB 1:7 *vér bárum hlut hœra*, Hróm 1:1 *út heyrik svan sveita*, Eg lv 1:1 *þat mælti mín móðir*), and in even A2k-lines both sequences (BW+Q and Q+BW) are allowed (Haustl 6:4 *okbjǫrn faðir Mǫrnar*, Eg lv 4:8 *regnbjóðr / Háars þegna*). It is likely therefore that the phonetic shape of the words in question, rather than their syntactic function, dictates the order of constituents: because most attributives have enclitic (usually syllabic) inflectional endings, those words could not be accommodated in position 4 in E3-lines. In A2k-lines, however, such words could occur in positions 3-4, and they very frequently do (cf. the discussion of Type A2k, Chap. 5).

The examination of odd E3-lines revealed that there was a significant difference between the syntactic fillers of *lausavísur* and those of panegyric stanzas. A similar difference can be observed in the syntactic fillers of even E3-lines: in lines from *lausavísur*, position 4 is very often occupied by a first-person singular pronoun (accusative or dative) that refers to the skald and is part of a phrase describing an action that involves him as the recipient. This usage can be exemplified by the following lines from Gísli's *lausavísur*:

GSúrs 13:6	bekksagnir *mér fagna*
GSúrs 22:8	hornflœðar / *mik grœða*
GSúrs 28:2	gunnelda *mér falda*
GSúrs 31:2	árflognis *mik sáran*

GSúrs 32:2	benvíðis / **mér síður**
GSúrs 33:8	lífs vánir **mér gránar**
GSúrs 37:6	ítrslegnar **mik bíti.**

In encomiastic poetry, such references are rare and occur in the same contexts as the encliticized subjects in odd encomiastic E3-lines: Gráf 11:6 *hans bróðir mér góðu* ("plea for reward"), Hfr III, 20:8 *hvárt tveggja mér seggir* ("affirmation of hearsay").

Even E3-lines were common from the earliest *dróttkvætt* onward, and they are especially prominent in the poetry of Egill (18 lines), Glúmr Geirason (10 lines), Kormákr (20 lines), Gísli (18 lines), and Einarr skálaglamm (23 lines). The counterparts from eddic *fornyrðislag* usually consist of nominal phrases, but occasionally an adverb or a verb can occupy position 4:

Vsp 56:10	Fiǫrgyniar burr
Hym 3:2	orðbæginn halr
Þrk 18:2	Laufeyiar sonr
HH II, 4:14	Ylfinga man
Gǫr III, 6:2	sunnmanna gram
Hym 8:6	algullin, fram
Gǫr I, 2:2	alsnotrir fram
HH I, 36:4	ósǫnno bregðr
HH II, 28:8	rícmenni vart.

The popular eddic constructions with an enclitic preposition in position 4 (HH II, 50:10 *draumþinga til*) are excluded from *dróttkvætt* lines (see Chap. 2, p. 42).

Type E3 Verbal Odd: (55 lines)   *E3:* $\overset{\prime\prime}{\underset{\circ}{\mathbf{x}}}\times\times\overset{\prime\prime}{\underset{\circ}{\mathbf{x}}}\times$

Eg I, 1:7	hér sverjum þess hyrjar
Sindr 3:1	Selund náði þá síðan
Gráf 7:7	frægt þótti þat flotnum
Korm lv 31:1	framm þóttumk ek fláttu
Korm lv 48:7	hvat of kennum þat henni
Hfr III, 23:7	geta þykkjask þess gotnar
VGl 6:7	vinir fagna því vagna
Hfr V, 19:1	lítt hirði ek / lautar
Korm lv 50:5	rýðk eigi ek rauða
GSúrs 7:1	fell eigi ek fullum.

Type E3 verbal can be divided into two subgroups.[8] The first group consists of lines with a verb in position 1 (3 lines); lines belonging to the second group have a finite verb in positions 2-3 (52 lines). Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, the syntactic filler of the lines with a verb in position 1 is stereotyped. No nonalliterating nomen could follow the alliterating verb in position 1, and positions 2-3 are always occupied by an adverb: Korm lv 50:5 *rýðk eigi ek rauða*, GSúrs 7:1 *fell eigi ek fullum*, GSúrs 16:1 *vald eigi þú vígi* (see Kuhn 1983:151). All these lines are sentence introductory, and they have close correspondences in a cluster of *fornyrðislag* lines from the Helgi lays and the Sigurðr cycle:

HH I, 20:1	uggi eigi þú
HHj 7:7	þigg ec eigi þat
HHj 33:1	sacaz eigi þú
HH II, 18:1	hirð eigi þú
HH II, 33:11	hefðir eigi mat
Sg 17:3	samir eigi ocr
Hlr 3:1	bregðu eigi mér
Gðr II, 27:1	vilc eigi ec
Gðr II, 27:5	samir eigi mér
Gðr II, 34:5	verðr eigi mér
Ghv 18:7	sitr eigi hér.

It is perhaps no coincidence that two of the three *dróttkvætt* lines of this type occur in Gísli's poetry. His *lausavísur* contain not only overt references to the Guðrún poems but also striking verbal echoes (e.g, GSúrs lv 9, lv 29:5-8, and Ghv 3-4, Hmð 7:1-4; see E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1944).

Most odd E3 Verbal-lines have a finite verb in positions 2-3 and a nomen, pronoun, adverb, or infinitive in position 1. The lines are sentence introductory, and both resolution (position 1) and syllabic cohesion (positions 1-2) occur. The second alliterating stave falls in position 5, and the word in position 4 is always a pronoun or an adverb. Only in one line is the pronoun in position 4 adjectival: Oddr 2:7 *frægt gerðisk þat fyrða // forráð /.* This is one of the very rare cases in *dróttkvætt* lines in which a proclitic nonalliterating pronoun modifies a nominal phrase distinguished by alliteration. Such sequences are quite common in eddic poetry (Grp 41:4 *sem þín móðir sé*), but almost nonexistent in *dróttkvætt* (Kuhn 1983:129). It is clear then, that in odd lines of Type E3 Verbal, there is a strong syntactic cohesion between the words in positions 1-4, but because of the fillers in positions 4-6 (pronoun/adverb+//), no syntactic cohesion was possible between the word in position 4 and the alliterating word in the cadence (except in Oddr's line above).

Four lines contain sentence boundaries, all occurring before the cadence, and the lines come from the *lausavísur* of Kormákr, Gísli, and Hallfreðr:

Korm lv 15:3	hvat merkir nú / herkis
GSúrs 3:1	betr hugðak þá / brigði
GSúrs 33:7	líkn reynum svá / lauka
Hfr V, 19:1	lítt hirði ek / lautar.

Torf-Einarr (lv 5:5) was the first to employ this pattern, and it figures prominently in the *lausavísur* of Kormákr (14 lines) and Gísli (10 lines). The type was in general avoided in encomiastic poetry, and, when it occurs, it seems to serve emphatic purposes (cf. Type E2 Verbal Even):

Eg I, 1:7	hér sverjum þess hyrjar
Gráf 1:3	því biðjum vér þagnar
Hfr II, 2:3	hvat of dylði þess hǫlðar
Hfr III, 23:7	geta þykkjask þess gotnar.

A similar function can be observed in *lausavísur*, too, and the word in the cadence is often part of a vocative: Korm lv 31:1 *framm þóttumk ek fláttu*, Korm lv 34:1 *skaka verðum vér Skarði*, Korm lv 50:3 *þú skaltat mér þella*, GSúrs 13:3 *Eir várum þar aura*, GSúrs 19:3 *Eir varðat mér aura*, GSúrs 32:5 *slíkt dreymir mik seima*, Vígf I, 1:5 *þar gingum vér þrøngvir*, Eskál IV, 3:7 *víst hyggjum þat viggja*, BNjáll 1:1 *senn jósum vér svanni* (see Frank 1990). Most of the lines are subject related, and a first-person pronoun (*ek* [6 lines], *vér / vit* [5 lines], *mér / mik* [11 lines]) often occupies position 4. However, the most conspicuous feature of odd E3 Verbal-lines is the frequent occurrence of the verb *þykkja(sk)* (seem, appear, think) in positions 2-3:[9]

Eg lv 31:1	fyrir *þykki* mér fúra
Eg lv 43:3	ek *þóttumk* þó orka
Gráf 7:7	frægt *þótti* þat flotnum
Korm lv 31:1	framm *þóttumk* ek fláttu
Korm lv 45:1	seinn *þykki* mér søkkva
Þmáhl 8:1	reka *þóttumk* ek Rakna
Hfr III, 23:7	geta *þykkjask* þess gotnar
Gríss 1:1	nú *þykki* mér nǫkkurr.

The same holds true for *fornyrðislag* lines of this type:

Hym 19:5	verc *þiccia* þín
HH I, 7:1	drótt *þótti* sá
HH I, 43:1	sveinn *þóttir* þú
Fm 32:5	spacr *þœtti* mér
Fm 35:1	horscr *þœtti* mér

Sg 39:9	þó *þicciz* ér
Hlr 11:5	einn *þótti* hann þar
Gðr II, 12:1	nótt *þótti* mér.

Thus there are strong structural resemblances between lines of Type E3 Verbal in *dróttkvætt* and *fornyrðislag*. Eddic lines, which lack the additional alliterating stave in position 5, are not subject to the same restrictions as *dróttkvætt* lines with regard to the filler of position 4, and technically there should be no reason to avoid a nomen in that position. However, only two *fornyrðislag* lines contain a nomen in position 4 (Fm 41:3 *fram vísa scǫp*, Sg 28:1 *mér unni mær*); all other lines have a pronominal or adverbial filler. Whether eddic lines with a finite verb in positions 2-3, as well as the *eigi*-constructions (verb in position 1), owe their origin to influence from *dróttkvætt* poetry or vice versa is impossible to ascertain. There are no such lines in "Vǫlospá" and "Þrymsqviða," but all the remaining eddic poems in *fornyrðislag* have their share of odd E3 Verbal-lines. The first skaldic examples occur in the poetry of Torf-Einarr and Kormákr (*eigi*), and it appears that Gísli consciously may have introduced the *eigi*-lines in his *lausavísur* to evoke a connection with the lays of Guðrún. The fact that so few eddic lines contain a nominal filler in position 4 after a verb in positions 2-3, however, could indicate that the eddic poets had adopted the skaldic practice with regard to the filler of position 4.

Syntactically, odd E3 Verbal-lines are quite simple (V1 or V2). The lines are sentence introductory, sentence boundaries were apparently avoided, and the first four positions are characterized by strong syntactic coherence, by syllabic cohesion between positions 1-2, and by occasional resolution (position 1). The internal rhymes fall in position 1 or 2, and they seem to have no function in the syntactic organization of the lines.

Type XE3: (39 lines)   *XE3:* x̄x̄×⌣⌣́////×

Eg lv 5:3	né fágak dul drjúgan
Gunnh 1:3	konungr léta brim bíta
Korm lv 5:7	þat skyldak kyn kvinna
Korm lv 35:7	hvǫss angrar sú sessi
HolmgB 1:7	vér bárum hlut hæra
Hfr I, 9:1	þaðan verða fǫt fyrða
Korm lv 21:7	þá kysstak mey / miklu
GSúrs 34:3	stór fingum ben / brynju
Þklyppr 1:1	hygg eigi beð byggva
Eskál IV, 2:5	drepr eigi sá sveigir.

In Type XE3, alliteration falls in positions 4 and 5.[10] Hence the restrictions imposed by alliteration on the filler of position 4 in Type E3 no longer apply, and bimoric nomina can occur in that position and form a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence. The internal rhyme occasionally occupies position 4, and Snorri considered such XE-lines (and XE4-lines) a separate variant of *dróttkvætt*, which he called *stamhent* (the meter with the stuttering rhymes) because of the close proximity of the rhyming (and alliterating) syllables in positions 4 and 5 (Ht 45; *SnE* I: 658).

Structurally, Type XE3 is quite similar to Type E3 Verbal, and lines of this type can also be divided in two categories. The first category of lines has a finite verb in position 1, usually followed by the negation *eigi*, and the second has a verb in positions 2-3. The majority of XE3-lines belong to the second group, and only six lines have a verb in position 1:

Þklyppr 1:1	hygg eigi beð byggva
GSúrs 17:5	stendr eigi þat / þeygi
Eskál IV, 2:5	drepr eigi sá sveigir
Hfr V, 14:5	stendr eigi sá sendir
HolmgB 9:7	litar blóði svan sveita
Þjsk IV, 3:1	kvaðat sendir mik mundu.

Because position 1 does not alliterate, the initial sequence v+n should theoretically be possible in XE-lines. However, a nomen in positions 2-3 directly preceding the alliterating stave in position 4 results in the prohibited sequence n+//, and, when poets avail themselves of that opportunity (HolmgB 9:7; Þjsk IV, 3:1), the words in positions 4-6, rather than the words in positions 2-4, form syntactic units. All lines with *eigi* in positions 2-3 are from *lausavísur*, and one line belongs to Gísli, which confirms the suspicion that the presence of the *eigi*-constructions in his poetry was not due to chance.

Like Type E3 Verbal, Type XE3 is a sentence-introductory pattern that is characterized by both resolution (position 1) and syllabic cohesion (positions 1-2). But, because position 4 alliterates, positions 4-6 are usually occupied by syntactic units, such as a verbal phrase (*skyldi goð gjalda, léta brim bíta, kunnum skil skepja, létum nið njóta, mundum vit vilja*) or a nominal phrase (*mín móðir, dul drjúgan, fjǫl foldar, kyn kvinna, dul drjúga, hlut hæra, svan sveita, sá sveigir, fǫt fyrða, sá sendir, Sif slæðu*). In the latter case, the sequence of elements in positions 4-6 corresponds to that of even E3-lines (BW+Q or Q[pron.]+BW; see also Kuhn 1983:159).

Position 1 can be filled by a nomen (Gldr 5:3 *rauð fnýsti ben blóði*), by a pronoun (Korm lv 33:3 *vér kunnum skil skepja*), by an adverb (Hgóði 1:1 *vel launa mér mínir*), or by a conjunction (Hfr V, 19:5 *ef næðak Sif slæðu*). In this respect Type XE3 differs from Type E3 Verbal, in which only nomina, pronouns, and

adverbs could occupy the initial, alliterating position. Owing to the structure (finite verb in positions 2-3) and clause function (sentence introductory) of XE3-lines, however, no proclitic particle or preposition could occupy position 1. Most internal rhymes fall in position 2 (23 lines), and position 1 is only distinguished by rhyme if the filler is nominal or adverbial (Gldr 5:3 *rauð fnýsti ben blóði*, Eg lv 26:3 *hugr tjóðum mjǫk mága*, Korm lv 35:7 *hvǫss angrar sú sessi*, Hróm 1:1 *út heyrik svan sveita*, Bbreiðv 1:1 *guls mundum vit vilja*, Hfr V, 3:7 *betr unnum nú nytja*).

Five lines have sentence boundaries after position 4, and, with one exception, they all belong to the same group of skalds that allowed sentence boundaries in Type E3 Verbal Odd (Kormákr, Gísli, and Hallfreðr):

Korm lv 21:7	þá kysstak mey / miklu
GSúrs 34:3	stór fingum ben / brynju
Vell 15:7	þeim stýra goð / geira
Hfr III, 14:7	sú gerðisk vel / varða.

It is clear then that sentence boundaries in general are avoided in this type of line, and that accords well with the conditions in sentence-introductory lines of Types E2 Verbal Even, E3 Odd, and E3 Verbal Odd.

Although XE3-lines are sentence introductory, they occur more frequently as line 3 (24 lines) than as line 1 (15 lines), and they often introduce parenthetic asides. Curiously enough, the verb *þykkja(sk)*, which occurred with such high frequency in positions 2-3 in Type E3 Verbal, is entirely absent in Type XE3, and the parenthetic statements contained in the XE3-lines are comments on actions rather than subjective speculations from the poets' point of view. Only four lines come from encomiastic poems, and, like Type E3 Verbal, this pattern is characteristic of *lausavísur*. It occurs most frequently in the *lausavísur* by Egill (8 lines) and Kormákr (8 lines), and it was also favored by Hallfreðr (6 lines). Type XE3 has no counterparts in *fornyrðislag*, but syntactically and functionally the *dróttkvætt* lines are quite close to the E3 Verbal-lines, and the type most likely originated in the attempt to accommodate nomina in position 4 in odd E-lines.

Type E3 Verbal Even: (64 lines)   E3: $\|\breve{\bar{x}}\times\breve{x}\,o\times$

Eg I, 1:6	allts lægra kynfrægjum
Eg lv 34:4	getk aldri vin betra
Eyv lv 7:4	bugusk almar / geð falma
TE 5:8	skala ugga þat / hǫggvit
Þorggoð 1:2	gnast / kannkat þat lasta
Eg lv 32:4	eir veittak Friðgeiri
Korm lv 42:8	alin verði Steingerði

Haustl 17:2	bǫnd ollu því / randa
Haustl 17:4	íss / vildu svá dísir
Korm I, 6:4	fats / véltu goð Þjaza.

Even lines of Type E3 Verbal are quite heterogenous and will be examined in two separate groups, in accordance with the placement of the finite verb (position 1 or 2-3).[11] Seventeen lines have a verb in position 1. Unlike odd lines of this type, in which the sequence v́+n was prohibited, no such restrictions apply in even lines, and position 4 can be filled by a nomen (5 lines), as well as by an adverb (7 lines) or an infinitive (3 lines). No even line has the adverb *eigi* in positions 2-3; such constructions must have belonged exclusively to odd lines. Thirteen lines are sentence introductory, and eleven consist of a single, independent clause that occupies positions 1-6 (8 lines), 1-4 (4 lines), or 1-3 (1 lines). Four lines have resolution on the finite verb in position 1 (TE 5:8, Eyv lv 7:4, Vell 33:2, Hfr III, 4:2). Unless there is a sentence boundary after position 1 (Þorggoð 1:2, GSúrs 6:2; see the discussion below), the internal rhyme regularly falls in position 2.

Positions 4-6 tend to form syntactic units, either nominal (*kynfrægjum, vin betra, Syn geira, lið minna, vinr feimu, her drengja, Búseyru*), adverbial (*framm gǫrva*), or verbal (*geð falma*) phrases. Only two lines have a sentence boundary after position 4 (TE 5:8 *skala ugga þat / hǫggvit*, Hfr I, 9:2 *fregnk gǫrla þat / Sǫrla*), and both contain a parenthetic exclamation in positions 1-4. One line has a sentence boundary after position 3 (Eyv lv 7:4 *bugusk almar / geð falma*), with an independent clause in positions 1-3. The pattern clearly serves the purpose of accommodating complete parenthetic clauses in even lines, and with one exception (Eg I, 1:6) none of these clauses is continued in a later line. As such, they have the same function as the eddic lines Grp 36:2 *má ec líta þat*, 45:2 *máttu þegia þó*, and 48:8 *segðu, Grípir, þat*.

Lines with a verb in positions 2-3 are much more common (46 lines), and they can be divided into two relatively sharply delineated groups. Eight lines have a sentence boundary after position 4 and structurally resemble odd lines of this type:

Haustl 17:2	bǫnd ollu því / randa
HolmgB 6:6	minnst dyljum þess / hylja
GSúrs 16:4	mér heitið því / sleitu
GSúrs 23:4	lítt týnik því / dýnur
Hallbj 1:2	eik firrumk þat / leika
VGl 1:6	hér tínik þat / mínum
Vell 7:4	gramr svafði bil / hafði
Hfr III, 26:2	ek sanna þat / manna.

Positions 1-4 contain a parenthetic exclamation, and position 4 is usually occupied by a pronoun. This pattern obviously serves a rhetorical function, which is also

evident in Snorri's variant *tilsagt* ('pattern with embedded explanation,' Ht 25; *SnE* I: 634-36; Kuhn 1983:168; and Chap. 1, p. 15), in which an independent statement occupies positions 1-4: Ht 25:2 *ǫl virðik svá / fyrðum*, Ht 25:6 *mjǫðr heitir svá / veita*, Ht 25:8 *vín kallak þat/galli*. In Snorri's lines, all the inserted clauses provide information on a certain topic (intoxicating fluids), and they occur in all even lines of the stanza (Ht 25:4 is a verbal E4-line: *bjórr forn es þat / horna*). In *dróttkvætt* stanzas of the ninth and tenth centuries this pattern is never consistently carried through as in Ht 25, and as far as the content is concerned the clauses in positions 1-4 comment on the action described in the *helmingr*, not on such extraneous matters as alcoholic beverages. But the structure of such lines, which was designed to accommodate short, emphatic, independent clauses, must have been eminently suited for Snorri's parenthetic explanations.

Another twelve lines also contain sentence boundaries, but these syntactic breaks fall before the cadence:

Haustl 17:4	íss / vildu svá dísir
Gldr 7:2	rymr / knáttu spjǫr glymja
Eg lv 35:6	gjǫld / finnumsk vér sjaldan
Eg lv 43:6	mǫgr / hétumk þá fǫgru
Hgóði 1:2	menn / œxlum styr þenna
Korm I, 6:4	fats / véltu goð Þjaza
Korm lv 40:2	Hlín / valda skǫp sínu
EValg 1:4	hljóð / eigum slǫg rjóða
GSúrs 20:2	ruðr / vekjum mjǫð Suðra
VGl 7:4	morð / váru þau forðum
EVald 3:2	seiðr / renndu framm breiðar.

All these lines are sentence concluding, not sentence introductory, and they have no correspondence in odd lines, in which there is a strong syntactic cohesion between the word in position 1 and the finite verb in positions 2-3. Even lines with a sentence boundary after position 1 usually contain an independent statement in positions 2-6, and in that respect they are similar to Snorri's variant *hjástælt* ('pattern with sequential insertion,' Ht 13; *SnE* I:618, and Chap. 1, p. 15), in which these clauses were designed to achieve certain artistic effects.[12]

Unlike lines with a sentence boundary after position 4 (*tilsagt*), *hjástælt* lines often have a nomen in position 4 which forms a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence. If we look at the remainder of even lines of Type E3 Verbal, they tend to follow the same patterns: a pronominal or adverbial filler in position 4 (e.g., Hildr 1:4 *hví bellið því stillir*, VGl 11:2 *aldr bǫlvar mjǫk skaldi*) or a nomen in position 4 (e.g., GSúrs 34:6 *minn hugðak Syn tvinna*, Hfr III, 17:2 *Holms verða Týr sverða*). Most lines without sentence boundaries either contain one independent parenthetic clause (12 lines), or they are sentence continuing (7 lines) or concluding (7 lines).

The main difference between odd and even lines belonging to Type E3 Verbal lies in their clause function, and that function is closely connected with the placement of sentence boundaries. If a line introduces an independent clause, it tolerates no sentence boundary before the finite verb, and the words in positions 1-4 form a syntactic unit with frequent syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2. Because of the restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd lines, no syntactic unit can occupy positions 4-6 (except in XE3), but, although sentence boundaries are possible after position 4, such breaks were clearly avoided. In even lines, Type E3 Verbal fulfilled three different functions. An uninterrupted parenthetic clause could occupy the whole line (= odd E3 Verbal and XE3). positions 1-4 (*tilsagt*), or positions 2-6 (*hjástælt*). In the former two instances the lines correspond structurally to odd lines (except for the filler of position 4): the internal rhymes tend to fall in position 2, and syllabic cohesion occurs between the words in positions 1-2. In *hjástælt*, however, there is no syllabic cohesion between the words in positions 1-2: the syllable in position 1 is either long or protected by an enclitic consonant (*rymr, fats, ruðr*), and the internal rhyme always falls in position 1 before the sentence boundary. The structure of Type E Verbal (odd and even), as well as that of Type XE3, clearly bears out the preliminary observations made earlier in this book: sentence boundaries were avoided in odd sentence-introductory lines and in sentence-introductory E-lines in general; syllabic cohesion was avoided across a sentence boundary; and the distribution of internal rhymes was closely connected with the syntax.

Even E3 Verbal-lines were common from the earliest *dróttkvætt* poetry onward, and the prototypes of Snorri's *tilsagt* and *hjástælt* were already present in Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng" (Haustl 17:2 *bǫnd ollu því / randa*, Haustl 17:4 *íss / vildu svá dísir*). Such lines provided the skalds with a welcome opportunity to fill "empty" positions in lines and stanzas, but it is equally clear that the lines could be used as a conscious artistic device to provide rhetorical asides. In eddic *fornyrðislag*, even E3 Verbal-lines are quite rare and, except for two lines from "Vǫlospá" (Vsp 36:4 *Slíðr heitir sú*, 38:4 *norðr horfa dyrr*), they are mainly restricted to "Hymisqviða" (e.g., Hym 8:2 *miǫc leiða sér*, 11:10 *Véorr heitir sá*, 21:8 *vað gorði sér*). Considering the semantic function of this type of lines in *dróttkvætt* poetry, its absence in eddic poetry, with few authorial interventions, is perhaps to be expected.

Type E4 Odd: (8 lines) E4: //x̄×x̄//x

Haustl 3:5	margspakr of nam mæla
Haustl 9:5	brunnakrs of kom bekkjar
Eg I, 1:5	Aðalsteinn of vann annat
Eg lv 9:1	Áleifr of kom jǫfri

Jór 4:7	upp angr of hófsk Yngva
Gráf 7:5	víðlendr of bað vinda
Glúmr lv 1:3	folkrakkr of vann fylkir
Vell 11:3	þrimlundr of jók Þundi.

There are only eight odd lines of Type E4. As in Type E3, the first two positions are occupied by two long, nominal syllables, but in E4, position 3 is proclitic rather than enclitic.[13] The second alliterating stave falls in position 5, and the restrictions imposed by alliteration are the same as in E3: no nomen can occur in position 4. The lines are sentence introductory with the finite verb in position 4 ($\breve{\times}$) preceded by the expletive particle *of*. Kuhn (1983:201) regarded such lines as violations of his law of sentence particles, but again we see that the verb occupies an $\breve{\times}$-position and not an $\times$-position, and the placement of the verb is in keeping with the rules of prose (V2).

There are no sentence boundaries in odd E4-lines, and the syllable in position 2 is either long or protected by an enclitic inflectional ending (-*spakr*). One line has resolution on the first syllable of a personal name in position 1. That line belongs to Egill's "Aðalsteinsdrápa," and the lines that are preserved from this panegyric show how Egill consciously plays with the only types of lines that would allow him to accommodate the name Aðalsteinn in *dróttkvætt* lines, namely E- and A2k-lines:

Eg I, 1	†nú hefr foldgnáar fellda	(Type C)
	fellr jǫrð und nið Ellu	(E4)
	hjaldrsnerrandi harra	(D)
	hǫfuðbaðmr þría jǫfra;	(A2k)
	Aðalsteinn of vann annat	(E4)
	allts lægra kynfrægjum	(E3)
	hér sverjum þess hyrjar	(E3)
	hrannbrjótr konungmanni;	(A2k)
Eg I, 2	nú liggr hæst und hraustum	(A)
	hreinbraut Aðalsteini.	(A2k)

This regular alternation of A2k- and E-lines is certainly deliberate, and Egill used the syllabic structure of the king's name to create a unique effect that was repeated throughout his panegyric.

The earliest odd E4-lines occur in Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng," and six of the eight lines come from encomiastic poetry. The syntax is simple, and in six lines the subjects or parts of the subject occupy positions 1-2 directly preceding the finite verb. In Haustl 9:5, part of the subject (attributive genitive) is introduced in positions 1-2 in the following even line: *brunnakrs of kom bekkjar // Brísings*

(*girðiþjófr*). Jórunn's line, with three alliterating staves, is quite unusual, but the placement of the subject (position 2) is not. The distribution of subjects in E4-lines then, corresponds entirely to that of odd E3-lines.

In eddic *fornyrðislag* there were no lexico-grammatical restrictions placed on the filler of position 4, and that position could be occupied by a nomen (HHj 43:3 *Rógheims á vit*, Br 18:3 *móðigr á vit*, Gðr II, 44:3 *þrágiarn í kǫr*), a pronoun (HH I, 16:3 *dǫglingr at því*), or a verb (HH I, 30:3 *fólcdiǫrf, um barg*, HHj 39:3 *buðlungr, sá er var*, Br 19:1 *benvǫnd of lét*).

Type E4 Even: (235 lines)   E4: ⫽₀x̄x×x̆ox

Haustl 13:8	bifkleif at Þórleifi
Hfr II, 5:2	barklaust í Danmǫrku
Gldr 5:4	bryngǫgl í dyn Skǫglar
Eg lv 4:6	oddskýs fyr þér nýsa
Hfr III, 17:6	Eiríkr eða hlut meira
Eg lv 8:8	Eyvindr of hljóp skreyja
Jór 2:4	sjá bragr / ens hárfagra
Gráf 8:2	hrynjeld at þat brynju
HolmgB 7:4	hugat mál of þat / brugðizk
Eg V, 1:2	ljósgarð / es þák / barða.

Next to Type A2k (294 lines), Type E4 is the most frequently found filler of even lines.[14] Position 5 does not alliterate and, as in odd E4 *fornyrðislag* lines, position 4 can be occupied by a nomen (Korm I, 2:2 *morðteins í dyn fleina*), a pronoun (Korm I, 6:2 *afspring með sér þingat*), an adverb (Korm lv 5:4 *allhvít ok þó lítit*), or a verb (Húsdr 5:4 *fránleitr / ok blés eitri*).[15] Position 3 is always proclitic, either a preposition (Hfr II, 4:2 *allvaldr í styr falla*), a connective (Oddr 2:2 *svellendr / en þar fellu*), the definite article *enn* (Þjsk IV, 6:6 *gunnelds enn fjǫlkunni*), or the expletive particle *of*, as in odd lines (Eyv lv 6:6 *Eiríks of rak / geira*). If the word in position 4 is a nomen or an adjectival pronoun, it tends to form a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence:

Glúmr I, 2:6	ráðvandr *á Skotlandi*
Jór 4:8	óblinds *fyr lof Sindra*
Gráf 5:2	orðrakkr *fyr bý norðan*
Hást 7:4	blóðfalls *of ná gjalla*
Sindr 5:2	svellrjóðr *at því fljóði.*

Similarly, if position 4 is occupied by a substantival pronoun or an adjective followed by a verb in positions 5-6, these elements always form a syntactic unit:

HolmgB 1:2	Haldullr *fyr sik gjalda*
GSúrs 24:8	ormláðs / *ok mér ráða*
GSúrs 34:2	hristendr *af mér kvista*
Sindr 7:2	opt sinn / *en þess minnumk*
Sindr 3:2	sóknheggr *und sik leggja*
GSúrs 19:8	beiðendr / *ef nú reiðumk*.

If the adjectival pronouns and adjectives are followed by a word other than a verb, however, such a unit is impossible:

Korm lv 43:2	Mengefn *of þat svefna*
Korm lv 54:2	ǫrg vættr *fyr mér tǫrgu*
Eyv lv 10:2	jǫfurr dýrr *an þik fyrra*
Sindr 2:8	víðfrægr *at þat síðan*
Korm lv 1:8	optarr *an nú* / *svarra*.

The number of such lines is relatively small, and most even E4-lines have a syntactic unit in positions 3-6 and the structure SS+SSSS (*Happþæg / i bilkrapta*) rather than SSSS+SS (*Happþæg / i bil / krapta*). Seventy-eight sentence boundaries fall after position 2, and only nine after position 4. In the latter case, the word in position 4 is usually a substantival pronoun or an adverb:

Vell 14:4	grandvarr **und sik** / landi
Þmáhl 8:4	klámorð **af mér** / borða
HolmgB 7:4	hugat mál **of þat** / brugðizk
Korm lv 1:8	optarr **an nú** / svarra
VGl 4:4	auðbœtt **við mik** / sœtan.

A nomen occupies the position directly before the sentence boundary in position 4 in only two lines (Steing 1:4 *góð mér ok skǫp / Fróða*, VGl 6:4 *goðreið of trǫð / kveðja*). Both lines conclude the *helmingr*. The words in the cadence complete an earlier disrupted nominal phrase, and it could well be that a certain license was possible in final position in lines 4 and 8. In one line the sentence boundary falls after a finite verb in position 4 (Eyv lv 6:6 *Eireks of rak / geira*). Thus the placement of sentence boundaries was intimately connected with the syntactic filler of the line, and the skalds clearly avoided placing a sentence boundary between two words that could potentially form a syntactic unit (n+n, n+v, n+Adv., Pron.+v, Adv.+v). That circumstance explains why, in odd E3 Verbal-lines, which only tolerated a pronoun or an adverb in position 4, sentence boundaries could occur after that position (e.g., Korm lv 15:3 *hvat merkir nú / herkis*). It also explains the syntactic filler in Snorri's *tilsagt* (Ht 25:2 *ǫl virðik svá / fyrðum*, 25:8 *vín kallak þat / galli*). There can be no doubt, then, that strong syntactic cohesion between the

elements in positions 4-6 was the rule and that sentence breaks before the cadence were signaled by the syntactic filler of position 4; that is, position 4 would be occupied by a word from a lexico-grammatical category that could not form a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence.

Two even E4-lines contain two sentence boundaries: Eg V, 1:2 *ljósgarð / es þák / barða*, Eyv lv 7:2 *landvǫrðr / es brast / Hǫrða*. Both lines have an embedded clause or part of a clause in positions 3-4, and the words in the cadence modify the compounds in positions 1-2 (*ljósgarð barða, landvǫrðr Hǫrða*). This tripartite structure bears all the marks of an innovation (most likely introduced by Egill), and the fact that it was never repeated later in the tenth century shows that the experiment could not have been considered very successful. Kuhn assumes similar tripartite structures for lines like HelgÓl 1:8 *Gauts tafn / en ná hrafni*, Vell 24:2 *víðfrægt / en gramr síðan*, and Steinunn 1:2 *Þangbrands ór stað lǫngu*, as well as four syntactic caesuras in Korm lv 19:4 *ljós / þér at ver kjósa* (*ljós / þér / at ver / kjósa*) and the E2-line Vell 32:4 *hlaut Óðinn val / Fróða* (*hlaut / Óðinn / val / Fróða;* Kuhn 1983:170). This excess of syntactic breaks makes the picture unnecessarily complicated, and Kuhn's syntactic breaks are again at cross-purposes with the syntactic organization of the lines. It is not clear, for instance, how such clauses as *hlaut Óðinn val* and *Þórr brá Þvinnils dýri // Þangbrands ór stað* could contain syntactic breaks. We have seen that E4-lines could contain two sentence boundaries, and some lines (with a substantival pronoun or an adverb in position 4) do indeed display a tripartite structure; that is, there is no syntactic cohesion between positions 2 and 3 or 4 and 5 (e.g., Rdr 8:2 *Óskrán at þat sínum*). However, the singular structure of the two lines with sentence breaks after positions 2 and 4, as well as the fact that there are no such later lines, speaks against equating lines like Rdr 8:2 *Óskrán at þat sínum*, Haustl 10:2 *byggvendr at þat hryggvir*, Gráf 8:2 *hrynjeld at þat brynju*, with Eg V, 1:2 *ljósgarð / es þák / barða*.

The first internal rhyme in E4-lines can fall in position 1 or 2, with a slightly higher number of rhymes in position 2 than in position 1. That is also the case if a sentence boundary falls after position 2. When the word in positions 1-2 is in the genitive, however, sixteen lines have internal rhyme in position 2, as opposed to only five with rhyme in position 1. In contrast, five out of eight internal rhymes occur in position 1 if there is a sentence boundary after position 4. Thus there was a pronounced tendency to place the internal rhyme in position 2 directly before a sentence boundary, especially if that sentence boundary fell after a disrupted genitive.

Only one line has syllabic cohesion between positions 2 and 3 and, curiously enough, this cohesion occurs between two elements that are separated by a sentence boundary (GSúrs 36:2 *Hǫrbil / þás vér skildumk*). But in view of the fact that no other line displays this structure, it is safe to conclude that syllabic cohesion was avoided in this position in even E4-lines, and this conclusion is again corroborated by the favored placement of sentence boundaries (after position 2).

Type E4 Even is sentence continuing or concluding, but if position 3 is occupied by a connective, a new clause (bound clause) can be introduced in positions 3-6 (47 lines).

The distinction between the filler of lines from *lausavísur* and lines from encomiastic poems which we observed in Type E3 also exists in Type E4. A first-person pronoun frequently occupies position 4, as is shown by the following examples from Gísli's *lausavísur*:

GSúrs 12:4	sómlaust á *mik* dómi
GSúrs 19:6	vekjendr / þeirs *mik* sekðu
GSúrs 24:8	ormláðs / ok *mér* ráða
GSúrs 29:4	andaðr / at *mér* standa
GSúrs 34:2	hristendr af *mér* kvista
GSúrs 35:2	silfrbands of *mér* standa
GSúrs 36:2	Hǫrbil / þás *vér* skildumk
GSúrs 37:2	fagrleit / sús *mik* teitir.

Such pronouns occur in lines from panegyrics only when they are part of "a plea for reward" (Korm I, 7:2 *allvald of mér halda*) or "a poetic boast" (Húsdr 8:2 *víðfrægr / en mér líða*).

We have seen that positions 4-6 in even E4-lines were characterized by strong syntactic cohesion. Around 25 percent of the lines contain a nominal phrase in those positions, and the order of elements is similar to that of Types E3 and XE3. In twenty lines a compound occupies those positions, mostly involving personal names or place names (see Kuhn 1983:111). Consider the following examples:

Haustl 13:8	bifkleif at Þórleifi
Eg lv 5:4	dáðmildr / ok Gunnhildar
Jór 2:4	sjá bragr / ens hárfagra
Korm lv 9:8	orð margt við Steingerði
GSúrs 20:4	skjaldsteins frá Ingjaldi
Vell 34:2	hjaldrǫrr ok Sigvaldi
Hfr II, 4:8	geirþey á Skáneyju
Hfr II, 5:2	barklaust í Danmǫrku.

Some of these compounds have a long first element, and this is the only time a long nomen can occur in position 4 in E4-lines. In the poetry from the ninth and tenth centuries, these long nomina are all first components of names; all other compounds in positions 4-6 have bimoric first elements (e.g., Korm lv 2:8 *eldask / hjá þreskeldi*, Korm lv 54:4 *blaðshund at hjǫrfundi*, Hást 1:4 *sárteins á brústeinum*, Þjsk IV, 6:6 *gunnelds enn fjǫlkunni*). The high number of personal names in these positions is somewhat surprising, but most likely resulted from the

poets' desire to emphasize the names of their protagonists (see Kuhn 1983:178). Kuhn was not sure about the levels of stress on the two elements of such compounds, but he maintained that the second element was most likely stressed more strongly than the first (Kuhn 1983:177). Snorri lists a variant of *dróttkvætt* with lines containing trisyllabic compounds in positions 4-6 (Ht 29; *SnE* I:640). He calls the meter *detthent* (the meter with stumbling or falling rhyme), and as examples he gives four even E3-lines: Ht 29:2 *heims vistir ótvistar*, 29:4 *seimgildi fémildum*, 29:6 *fleinstýri margdýrar*, 29:8 *hoddspennir fjǫlmennum*. The name of that meter may support Kuhn's speculations about the levels of stress in these compounds: if the second element with the internal rhyme received additional emphasis during recitation, such an intonation could have produced a "stumbling" or "falling" effect.

We have seen then that even E4-lines are characterized by lack of syntactic and syllabic cohesion between positions 2 and 3, and by strong syntactic cohesion between positions 3-6. The syntactic cohesion could be interrupted if a substantival pronoun or an adverb occurred in position 4, and the few lines that contain sentence boundaries before the cadence more often than not avoided a nominal filler of position 4. E4-lines were eminently suited to accommodate interrupted nominal elements in positions 1-2. The type first occurs in Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng" and remained common in both panegyrics and in *lausavísur*, especially in the poetry of Egill (21 lines), Kormákr (44 lines), Gísli (20 lines), Þórarinn máhlíðingr (12 lines), Einarr skálaglamm (19 lines), and Hallfreðr (44 lines). In eddic poetry, even E4-lines are not uncommon and they figure prominently in "Hymisqviða" (e.g., Hym 2:6 *Yggs barn í þrá*, 3:4 *hann næst við goð*, 24:6 *sá fiscr í mar*, as well as Vsp 51:8 *Býleiptz í for*, Sg 22:2 *hergiarn í sal*, Gǫr II, 6:4 *fólcvorð at gram*).

Type E4 Verbal Odd: (10 lines)   E4: $\parallel\!\underset{\circ}{\bar{\times}}\!\times\bar{\times}\!\parallel\!\underset{\circ}{\times}$

Halli 1:3	ljúg vætr at mér leygjar
Korm lv 30:3	mærð berk fyr þik mína
Korm lv 61:7	skjótt segik til þess skǫtnum
Vell 22:7	Ullr stóð á því / allri
Þjsk I, 1:7	vesa mátt af því vísi
Hfr III, 5:7	mein hlautk af því / mínir
Hfr III, 18:3	snǫrp varð at þat sverða
Eg lv 10:7	helnauð es þat / hylja
Húsdr 6:3	ramt mein vas þat / reyni
Gamli 2:1	ǫðlingr drap sér ungum.

Type E4 Verbal Odd has a finite verb in position 1, 2, or 3. Position 4 is always occupied by a substantival pronoun (= Type E3 Verbal), and there is no syntactic

cohesion between the words in positions 4 and 5-6. If the verb occupies position 1, the filler of position 2 is adverbial, as in E3 Verbal-lines (GSúrs 7:1 *fell eigi ek fullum*), to avoid the prohibited sequence v́+n. The placement of the finite verbs corresponds to that of prose (V1, V2), but lines like Eg lv 10:7 *helnauð es þat / hylja* indeed seem to violate Kuhn's law of sentence particles: the verb occurs in an x-position, and it is not enclitic to the first stressed word in the line (cf. Kuhn's distribution of stresses; Kuhn 1983:150, 201).

Because of the substantival pronoun in position 4 and the lack of syntactic unity in positions 4-6, sentence boundaries may fall before the cadence, and in four out of ten lines they do: Vell 22:7 *Ullr stóð á því / allri*, Hfr III, 5:7 *mein hlautk af því / mínir*, Eg lv 10:7 *helnauð es þat / hylja*, Húsdr 6:3 *ramt mein vas þat / reyni*. The filler of positions 1-4 consists of a parenthetic clause, and three of the four clauses are quite similar in content. Egill's line laments the death of his brother Þórólfr in the battle of Vínuheiðr ("helnauð es þat" 'that is a deadly oppression'), Hallfreðr mourns his friends who fell in the battle of Svǫldr ("[meir] mein hlautk af því" 'I got more grief from that'), and Ulfr Uggason describes the devastating effects of Þórr's hammer blow on the head of the World Serpent ("ramt mein vas þat," 'that was terrible damage'). This similarity could, of course, be coincidental, but it demonstrates the poetic function of odd E4 Verbal-lines: like odd E3 Verbal-lines, they were sentence introductory, but they occur in line 3 (all but 1) and introduce a short, subjective, emphatic statement. More than 50 percent of these lines belong to panegyrics, and the first occurs in "Vellekla." Egill's *lausavísa* 10, which contains the first example of an E4 Verbal-line with the verb in position 4, has been deemed spurious by scholars (see Kuhn 1983:262). The stanza also has features that are characteristic of Egill's poetry, such as an odd E3-line with a sentence boundary before the cadence (Eg lv 10:3 *þreklundaðr fell / Þundar*) and an odd XE4-line (Eg lv 10:5 *jǫrð grœr / en vér verðum*), so the case of forgery might not be so clear-cut after all.

Eddic *fornyrðislag* contains examples of all three types of E4 Verbal-lines, but because there were no restrictions on the filler of position 4, that position can be occupied by nomina as well as by pronouns: Hym 10:5 *gecc inn í sal*, Hym 31:1 *harðr reis á kné*, HH I, 2:1 *nótt varð í bœ*, HH I, 53:1 *svipr einn var þat*, HHj 33:9 *if er mér á því*, Grp 25:7 *dœgr eitt er þér*, Od 18:5 *vara langt af því*.

Type XE4: (50 lines)   XE4: x̄x̄×/////×

Korm lv 38:1	esa mér sem Tinteini
VGl 1:7	munat enn of styr stála
Korm lv 54:3	lætk niðr á bak bíta
Korm lv 39:1	veit hinn / es tin tannar
Eg lv 24:1	kominn emk á jó Íva

Korm I, 5:1	hróðr gerik of mǫg mæran
HolmgB 8:7	nú lætk / at þar þrjóti
Eg lv 37:7	grepp / skulum á veg vappa
Hást 2:5	en tolf af glað Gylfa
Gamli 1:1	þás gramr / hinns svik samðit.

Like Type XE3, Type XE4 has alliteration in positions 4 and 5, and there are no restrictions on the filler of position 4. In 50 percent of the lines (23 lines), positions 4-6 are occupied by a nominal phrase, and, of the remaining lines, sixteen have a verbal phrase in those positions. Only nine lines have no syntactic unit in positions 4-6 (*ór sal sæta, af þér þella, í dag dauði, með sér sínum, af ná neyta, af stoð stundum, í vá víða, at sá síðan, þvít vel Viðris*), but none of these has a sentence boundary after position 4 (two have a sentence boundary after position 2).

According to Kuhn (1983:156-57), a syntactic caesura always fell between positions 4 and 5 in our XE4-lines. The fillers of positions 4-6 in those lines nevertheless display the exact same features as the fillers of even E4-lines, which were characterized by a strong syntactic coherence. The fillers that were associated with syntactic breaks in Types E4 and E4 Verbal were avoided (except Korm lv 51:3 *golls hlykk af þér þella*, GSúrs 22:1 *heim bauð með sér sínum*, Bbreiðv 1:3 *grand fæk af stoð stundum*, Hfr I, 5:1 *ráð lukusk / at sá síðan*, and Hfr V, 7:5 *en trauðr / þvít vel Viðris*). There is no evidence, then, that a syntactic break fell between the alliterating staves in Type XE4; rather, the majority of such lines had a syntactic unit in position 4-6. XE4-lines are sentence introductory and the finite verb occupies position 1 (10 lines) or position 2 (33 lines). Six lines contain no verb but have an introductory element in position 1, thus introducing a bound clause rather than an independent clause:[16]

Korm lv 59:3	þás vér of fen fórum
Hást 2:5	en tolf af glað Gylfa
GSúrs 3:5	þás vér í sal sátum
Gamli 1:1	þás gramr / hinns svik samðit
Tindr II, 2:3	ok tveir at gný geira
Hfr V, 7:5	en trauðr / þvít vel Viðris.

As Kuhn has shown, there is a distinct difference between the placement of finite verbs in independent and bound clauses in both alliterative and skaldic poetry (Kuhn 1933:50-69, 1983:116-20). According to him, the finite verbs in bound clauses were stressed more strongly than the verbs in independent clauses, which were for the most part unstressed and subject to his law of sentence particles. In bound clauses, he claims, the finite verbs usually received full stress and could occur further back in a sentence, comparable to the situation in

Modern German (Kuhn 1983:118). The sentence-introductory patterns that we
have treated so far have all contained independent clauses (except XE3-lines
with a connective in position 1: Hfr V, 27:5 *ef dauðan mik meiðar*), and we
have seen that the placement of the finite verbs, although in some instances in
violation of Kuhn's law of sentence particles, always corresponds to that of
prose (V1 or V2), and that no sentence boundary could occur before the verb.
But when the finite verbs are suspended to a later line, as in the examples
above, sentence boundaries could occur prior to the introduction of the verb.
Consider the following example:

> Hfr V, 7:5-8   en trauðr / (þvít vel Viðris
> vald hugnaðisk skaldi)
> ***legg'k*** á frumver Friggjar
> fjón / (þvít Kristi þjónum).

Altogether there are seventeen sentence boundaries in Type XE4, and, with one
exception, they fall after position 2, as was the rule in even E4-lines. One line, Eg
lv 37:7 *grepp / skulum á veg vappa*, has a sentence boundary after position 1. That
line is not sentence introductory but sentence continuing, and in that respect it
corresponds structurally to such even E4 Verbal-lines as Korm lv 60:2 *Hlín / sof
hjá ver þínum* (see below, p. 102). Both resolution and syllabic coherence occur at
the onset of XE4-lines (e.g., Eg lv 24:1 *kominn emk á jó Íva*, Gunnh 1:1 *Há reið á
bak báru*), and the internal rhymes fall in position 1, 2, or 4 (*stamhent*). In Egill's
line, with a sentence boundary after position 1, the word preceding the sentence
boundary is trimoric and distinguished by internal rhyme, which again goes to
show that the placement of internal rhymes had an important function in
delineating the syntactic organization of a line.

Type XE4, which has no correspondents in eddic *fornyrðislag*, occurs
frequently in the poetry by Egill (6 lines) and Kormákr (11 lines), and Kormákr
employs such lines in his encomiastic poetry (Korm I, 5:1) as well as in his
lausavísur. In three stanzas he uses XE4-lines to accommodate the nickname of his
adversary, Þorvaldr tinteinn, or to make an onomastic pun on it (Korm lv 38:1 *esa
mér sem Tinteini*, lv 49:7 *því skal mér an Tinteini*, lv 39:1 *veit hinn / es tin tannar*).
Kuhn (1983:289) suggests that Kormákr's use of this type of line could have been
triggered by Þorvaldr's nickname, and Kormákr undoubtedly reveled in the ear-
catching internal rhymes and double alliteration on the name *tinteinn*. Most XE4-
lines are found in *lausavísur*, but Hallfreðr puts them to good use in his
encomiastic poetry, and they figure more prominently in his "Erfidrápa" (5 lines)
than in his *lausavísur* (2 lines).

Type E4 Verbal Even: (59 lines)   E4: ⫽x̄̄x̄x̄x̄ o x

Eg I, 1:2	fellr jǫrð und nið Ellu
Eg lv 9:2	ótt v's víg / á bak flótta
Brúsi 1:2	veitk orð á því / borða
EValg 1:2	verðr dynr / ef má / sverða
Hfr I, 4:2	ferr jǫrð und menþverri
Vell 36:2	fullr varð / en spjǫr gullu
VGl 8:2	orð lék á því / forðum
Korm lv 60:2	Hlín / sof hjá ver þínum
Hfr III, 27:6	skalmǫld hefr því valdit
Vell 25:6	hagnaðr vas þat / bragna.

The placement of finite verbs in Type E4 Verbal Even is similar to that of odd E4 Verbal-lines. The verb can occupy position 1, 2, or 3. But unlike in odd lines, there are no restrictions on the filler of position 4, which can be nominal, pronominal, or adverbial. If the finite verb occurs in position 1 (24 lines), the lines are usually sentence introductory (18 lines), but they rarely introduce a sentence that is continued beyond the even line. Sentence boundaries may fall after positions 2 (1 lines) or 4 (4 lines). In the latter case, the word in position 4 tends to be a substantival pronoun or an adverb (Brúsi 1:2 *veitk orð á því / borða*, Eskál I, 1:2 *lék orð á því / forðum*, Hfr III, 22:8 *mjǫks verr an svá / ferri*). Conversely, lines with a nomen in position 4 usually have a nominal syntactic unit in positions 4-6 (*nið Ellu, víkingum, sjǫt manna, hal bleikan, gjǫf Þróttar, hug stinnum, ná getnum, menþverri, dyn Gunnar, hlut þenna*). The order of elements in these nominal phrases is similar to the order of such elements in positions 4-6 in E3-4. One line has a tripartite structure, with a two-word embedded clause in positions 3-4 (EValg 1:2 *verðr dynr / ef má / sverða*). Structurally this line is identical to the two tripartite E4-lines examined earlier, in that the genitival attributive in the cadence modifies the nomen directly before the sentence break in position 2 (*dynr sverða*).

E4 Verbal-lines with the finite verb in position 2 (21 lines), behave very much like the lines with the verb in initial position. Sentence boundaries can fall after position 2 (2 lines) or 4 (4 lines), and the lines are sentence introductory (13 lines) as well as continuing or concluding (8 lines). The filler of positions 4-6 is similar, too, but with a greater tendency to allow a sentence boundary after a nomen in position 4 if the line concludes the *helmingr*, as in Type E3 Verbal, above. Consider the following examples:

Eg lv 42:4	svik telk *í því* / kvikvan
VGl 8:2	orð lék *á því* / forðum
Haustl 13:4	sveipr varð *í fǫr* / Greipar
Vell 21:4	herr fell *of gram* / velli.

That is also the case in the only line from the previous group with a sentence boundary after a nomen in position 4, namely, Eg lv 30:8 *komi ǫrn á hræ / jǫrnum*.

The most striking characteristic of E4 Verbal-lines is their stereotyped content and verbal repetition. Those echoes can be heard in the stanzas of one poet, as in Egill's lv 1:4 *fara á brott með víkingum* and 7:4 *gangr v's harðr af víkingum*, but more often they are part of a system of stock phrases and concepts that were borrowed from poet to poet, as the following examples show:

HolmgB 7:6	teitan ‖ tók hrafn á ná jafnan
Hást 4:6	hrafn sleit af ná beitu
Þmáhl 8:6	hrafn sleit af ná beitu
Þmáhl 15:2-3	ek veit / at gat beitu ‖ hrafn af hræva efni
Þjsk I, 1:6	etr hrafn af ná getnum
Korm lv 63:8	hrafni ‖ heitr fellr á nef sveiti
Eg lv 30:8	komi ǫrn á hræ / jǫrnum;
GSúrs 22:6	mank orð of þat skorðu
VGl 8:2	orð lék á því / forðum
Brúsi 1:2	veitk orð á því / borða
Eskál I, 1:2	lék orð á því / forðum.

These asides add little to the content, but they must have enabled the skalds to fill lines and parts of lines without detracting from the main message of the *helmingr*.

The group of lines with the finite verb in position 3 (11 lines) corresponds structurally to odd E4 Verbal-lines with the verb in that position (cf. Eg lv 10:7 *helnauð es þat / hylja*). Position 4 is occupied by a substantival pronoun or an adverb, and sentence boundaries could fall after position 4, unless the pronoun or adverb is preceded by an auxiliary and followed by an infinitive or participle (*hefr því valdit, mun nú verða*). The lines furnish additional information or subjective comments on the action described in the *helmingr*. As such they belong to Snorri's variant *tilsagt* (Ht 25:4 *bjórr forn es þat / horna*), and, unlike most of the stereotyped parenthetic clauses above, they must have added an emphatic flavor to the stanza. In encomiastic poetry, they function as exclamatary interjections foregrounding the achievements of the eulogized chieftain, as in Vell 14:2 *snúnaðr vas þat / brúna*, Vell 25:6 *hagnaðr vas þat / bragna*, Hfr III, 11:6 *sverðjalmr óx þar/verða*. In *lausavísur*, these parenthetic exclamations are frequently coupled with special rhetorical features, like *dunhent* and *liðhent* (internal rhymes carried over from the odd to the even lines: Ht 24, 41; *SnE* I:634, 652), as in the following lines:

Eg lv 16:7-8	þigg **Au**ð**a** konr *eið*a ‖ *eið*sœrt es þat / gr*eið*a
HolmgB 6:1-2	þótta ek / þás *æri* ‖ *ár*sagt es þat / v*ár*um
Hfr V, 11:3-4	fyr Svipnj**ǫrð**um sv*erð*a ‖ sv*erð*ótt mun nú v*erð*a.

A small group of four lines has a sentence boundary after position 1 and the finite verb in position 2, or an infinitive in positions 5-6:

Korm lv 60:2	Hlín / sof hjá ver þínum
Korm lv 60:6	Frigg / heldr an mér liggja
Korm lv 19:4	ljós / þér at ver kjósa
Hfr V, 9:8	feðr / einn ok goð kveðja.

These lines have correspondents in even *hjástælt*-lines (Korm I, 6:4 *fats/véltu goð Þjaza*) and in the odd XE4-line Eg lv 37:7 *grepp / skulum á veg vappa*. Snorri labels even lines of this structure *orðskviðuháttr* ('the proverb meter,' Ht 26; *SnE* I:636), and in his model stanza all even lines have a proverb in positions 2-6: Ht 26:2 *fens / bregðr hǫnd á venju*, 26:4 *rǫf / spyrr ætt at jǫfrum*, 26:6 *raun / sér gjǫf til launa*, 26:8 *lengr / vex hverr af gengi*. That is not the case in the even E4 Verbal-lines above, in which only one contains a verb in position 2. Three of the four lines belong to Kormákr, and that is surely not fortuitous. Kormákr shows a marked preference for *hjástælt*-constructions, and his "Sigurðardrápa" is the only tenth-century poem in which mythological *hjástælt*-insertions are systematically carried out in the manner prescribed by Snorri's Ht 13. Thus even E3-4-lines with a sentence boundary after position 1 were characteristic of Kormákr's poetry, and he employed them in his *lausavísur* as well as in his panegyrics.

In even E4 Verbal-lines with sentence boundaries after position 2 or 4, the first internal rhyme could fall in position 1 or 2, and that rhyme had no apparent function in the syntactic organization of the lines. Resolution in position 1 and syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2 are not uncommon (e.g., Eg lv 28:2 *fǫrum holms á vit sǫrvar*, Eg lv 42:4 *svik telk í því / kvikvan*). In lines without sentence boundaries, syllabic cohesion can also occur between positions 2 and 3 (Eg lv 29:2 *leik ek við hal bleikan*). But if the sentence boundary falls after position 1, that position is always occupied by a trimoric syllable and distinguished by rhyme (and alliteration).

In eddic poetry, E4 Verbal-lines with a finite verb in position 3 are scarce (e.g., HH II, 42:8 *dǫglingr bað þic*), and most lines have a verb in position 1 (Vsp 57:2 *sígr fold í mar*, HH I, 33:2 *slǫng up við rá*, Sg 23:6 *fell aptr í stað*, Gðr I, 13:6 *legðu munn við grǫn*) or position 2 (Hym 38:2 *hverr kann um þat*, Rm 17:8 *hverr spyrr at því*). Because of the few authorial interjections in eddic poems, the absence of the exclamatory comments that characterize *dróttkvætt* lines is not surprising (cf. the similar absence of even E3 Verbal-lines).

Type B Odd: (13 lines) B: $\times_0^{\prime\prime}\times\tilde{\times}_0^{\prime\prime}\times$

Rdr 8:5	þás Hristisif. hringa
Þmáhl 2:7	þá vas dœmisalr dóma
Hfr V, 15:5	en dreypilig drúpir
Haustl 2:7	vasa Byrgitýr bjarga
Haustl 3:7	vasa Hœnis vinr hánum
Eg lv 16:7	þigg Auða konr eiða
Rdr 20:3	of manna sjǫt margra
Vst 1:3	við gómasker glymja.

Unlike eddic *fornyrðislag*, which contains a wealth of odd B-lines, *dróttkvætt* poems clearly avoid the type.[17] There are only thirteen lines in the excerpted corpus, and seven of those lines belong to Bragi and Þjóðólfr. There are no sentence boundaries in Type B, and the words in positions 2-6 usually form a syntactic unit (nominal or verbal). In *fornyrðislag* lines the syllable in position 3 can be enclitic (Vsp 50:3 *snýz iǫrmungandr*) or proclitic (Vsp 33:5 *enn Frigg um grét*), and double alliteration occurs frequently (Vsp 44:7 *um ragna rǫc,* 3:3 *vara sandr né sær*). In *dróttkvætt* lines, however, position 3 is always enclitic, and positions 2 and 5 alliterate. Bearing in mind the restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd E-lines, this could explain the scarcity of odd B-lines, as well as the absence of such *dróttkvætt* lines as †*ef góð um scǫp grœði*. In B-lines, as well as in the nonexistent odd lines of Types E1-2, a nomen would occur directly before the alliterating stave in position 5. If position 3 was proclitic, no nomen could occur before the cadence unless it carried alliteration (= XE4: Hást 2:5 *en tolf af glað Gylfa*). Hence, in B-lines, with a nonalliterating nomen in position 4, that nomen must belong syntactically to the preceding nomen, joined to it by an enclitic ending in position 3. Furthermore, if there was a syntactic unit in positions 2-6, the word in positions 5-6 modified the entire nominal phrase in positions 2-6, and not only the last element. In Rdr 20:3 that principle is carried even further, and the attributive adjective in positions 5-6 modifies the nomen in positions 2-3, not the nomen in position 4: Rdr 20:3 *of manna sjǫt margra* (ń+n+ń), that is, *of sjǫt margra manna*. If there was no syntactic unit in positions 2-6, that restriction would of course not apply (*Hœnis vinr hánum, Geitis vegr grjóti, Auða konr eiða*), but the fact that such constructions only occur in three out of thirteen lines shows that in B-lines, too, the skalds favored syntactic unity between position 4 and the cadence. Under these circumstances it is perhaps not so strange that odd B-lines were avoided. Odd lines of Type B were part of the earliest *dróttkvætt* tradition, but they became increasingly unpopular in the tenth century and continued to decrease in the eleventh (23 lines) and twelfth centuries (9 lines; Kuhn 1983:142). The fact that two such lines occur in "Ragnarsdrápa" seems to corroborate an early date for that poem.

Depending on the filler of position 1, odd lines of Type B could be either sentence introductory or sentence continuing (see Kuhn 1983:142). If position 1 was occupied by a connective or a finite verb, the lines were sentence introductory; if a preposition fell in that position, the line was sentence continuing. In sentence-introductory lines, the subject occurs either right after the verb or the connective (Rdr 8:5 *þás Hristisif hringa*, Haustl 2:7 *vasa Byrgitýr bjarga*, Haustl 3:7 *vasa Hœnis vinr hánum*, Þmáhl 2:7 *þá vas dœmisalr dóma*, Hfr III, 22:3 *at lofða gramr lifði*); in position 1, as part of the connective (Haustl 9:3 *þás ellilyf ása*); or in initial position in the following even line (Hfr V, 15:5 *en dreypilig drúpir // dýnu Rán /*). This distribution of the subject again corresponds to that of odd nominal E3-4 lines, above.

Concluding Remarks

The main difference between the syntactic fillers of odd and even lines belonging to group I is explained by restrictions imposed by alliteration in position 5. No nonalliterating nomen could occur proclitically to the alliterating syllable in position 5, and, in odd lines (with the exception of Types XE3-4), position 4 was occupied by a verb (E3-4), or a substantival pronoun or adverb (E3-4 Verbal; see Craigie's law). The types whose fillers demanded a nomen in position 4 (Types E1-2, and B) were avoided.

The different syntactic fillers account for the dissimilarity in the clause function of odd and even lines. Whereas odd lines are sentence introductory, even lines, unless they belong to Types E2-4 Verbal, are sentence continuing or sentence concluding. Odd lines of Types E3-4 and B usually introduce longer sentences, often in encomiastic poems. The subjects in such lines occur in close proximity to the verb, and their distribution is predictable. Sentence boundaries were clearly avoided in Types E3-4 and B, and in most cases the words in positions 4-6 form syntactic units (usually verbal phrases, except in Types XE3-4 and B). Thus there is no basis for Kuhn's contention that such lines always contained a syntactic caesura after position 4. Because a substantival pronoun or adverb could only form a syntactic unit with a following verb (or adverb), odd lines belonging to Types E3-4 Verbal could contain sentence boundaries before the cadence. In even lines, sentence boundaries after positions 1, 2, and 3 were much more common than after position 4, but when sentence boundaries after position 4 do occur, the lines are marked by the same sequences of fillers that characterize odd lines (substantival pronouns and adverbs in position 4). An exception appears to be made in lines that conclude a *helmingr*, in which a sentence boundary could fall between two nomina in positions 4 and 5-6. There can be no doubt that the skalds took great care to keep the syntax as simple as possible and that they tried to avoid constructions that

could cause syntactic confusion (cf. the placement of the subject and the filler of position 4).

Even lines belonging to Types E3-4 Verbal were predominantly sentence introductory, but, unlike odd E3-4 lines, they usually introduced short, parenthetic clauses that covered one line or part of one line and allowed the skald to fill "empty slots" in the *helmingr*. If such clauses occupied only the first four positions of the line, they would, because of the filler in position 4 (pronominal and verbal), more often than not have an emphatic character, as in the following lines:

Eg I, 1:7	hér sverjum þess hyrjar	(Odd E3 Verbal)
TE 5:8	skala ugga þat / hǫggvit	(Even E3 Verbal)
Hfr I, 9:2	fregnk gǫrla þat / Sǫrla	(Even E3 Verbal)
Eg lv 10:7	helnauð es þat / hylja	(Odd E4 Verbal)
Hfr III, 22:8	mjǫks verr an svá / ferri	(Even E4 Verbal)
Vell 25:6	hagnaðr vas þat / bragna	(Even E4 Verbal).

In these cases the poets clearly employed the parenthetic statement for artistic purposes, and Snorri used such lines as prototypes for his *dróttkvætt* variant *tilsagt* (Ht 25).

In those even lines in which sentence boundaries were not signaled by the syntax (i.e., by the filler of position 4), the placement of rhymes, as well as the lack of syllabic cohesion across the sentence boundary (and, apparently, also the lack of resolution) played a major role in delineating the syntactic structure. Such markings are prominent in lines with a sentence boundary after position 2, and even more so in lines with a sentence boundary after position 1, in which syllabic length as well as internal rhyme fell on the initial syllable (= Snorri's *hjástælt*; Ht 13).

The syntactic fillers of *lausavísur* differ from those of panegyrics. In the former, the poet addresses a situation that involved him personally, and first-person pronouns are scattered throughout the *helmingar*. In encomiastic poems, however, the eulogized chieftain is usually the subject, often circumscribed by a nominal *kenning*, and personal references to the skald are restricted to certain stereotyped statements ("bid for a hearing," "plea for reward," "poetic boast," and "confirmation of hearsay"). That distinction is especially significant in the filler of position 4, Types E3-4, in which odd lines from *lausavísur* very often contain the encliticized subject -*k*, and the even lines the personal pronouns *mik* / *mér*.

Certain skalds appear to have favored special types of fillers. Egill Skalla-Grímsson, for example, was fond of E2- and E3-lines (odd and even) with syntactic breaks before the cadence, and Goþþormr sindri introduced most of his independent sentences with Type E3, as the following lines from the eight extant stanzas of his "Hákonardrápa" show:

Sindr 1:1	bifrauknum trað bekkjar
Sindr 1:5	svangœðir rak síðan
Sindr 2:1	almdrósar fór eisu
Sindr 2:7	valsendir hrauð vandar
Sindr 4:1	skattgilda vann skyldir
Sindr 4:3	gollskýflir vann gjǫflastr
Sindr 6:1	valþagnar lét vegnum
Sindr 7:1	almdrógar varð œgis
Sindr 7:5	bǫðsœkir helt bríkar
Sindr 8:3	rógeisu gekk ræsir.

Kormákr Ǫgmundarson's poetry contains an abundance of XE3-4 lines, some of which could have been triggered by the nickname of his opponent, Þorvaldr tinteinn. Kormákr also favored even lines with sentence boundaries after position 1 (*hjástælt, orðskviðuháttr*), which occur both in his encomiastic poetry and in his *lausavísur*.

All types of *dróttkvætt* lines contained in group I also occur in eddic *fornyrðislag*, except Types XE3-4, which are skaldic innovations. There are, however, certain formal differences between the two poetic genres. Because odd *fornyrðislag* lines have no syllable with an alliterating stave in position 5, the fillers of such lines resemble those of even *dróttkvætt* lines (a nomen could occur in position 4). Odd *fornyrðislag* lines of Types E3-4 therefore functioned as sentence continuing as well as sentence introductory (with a verb in positions 4, 3-4). Certain patterns that developed independent artistic functions in *dróttkvætt*, such as the authorial asides in *tilsagt*, had no place in eddic *fornyrðislag*, and E3-4 Verbal fillers were in general rare and confined to those eddic poems which have been deemed most affected by skaldic influence (such as "Hymisqviða" and the first Helgi lay). In contrast, the distribution of the types in stanzas belonging to the earliest *dróttkvætt* tradition ("Ragnarsdrápa" and "Haustlǫng") is as follows: Type E2 Even (Rdr 2, Haustl 2), E3 Odd (Rdr none, Haustl 5), E3 Even (Rdr 5, Haustl 9), E3 Verbal Even (Rdr none, Haustl 2), E4 Odd (Rdr none, Haustl 2), E4 Even (Rdr 4, Haustl 6), B Odd (Rdr 2, Haustl 4). Neither of the two poems contained lines of Types E1, E2 Even Verbal, E3 Verbal Odd, E4 Verbal Odd, and XE3-4, that is, lines that are scarce or nonexistent in eddic *fornyrðislag*.

Group II: Types D1-2, A2k, and C

Type D1 Odd: (30 lines) $D1$: $\sh{\backslash\!\!/}\breve{x}\breve{x}\times\sh{\backslash\!\!/}\times$

Haustl 5:7	ósvífrandi ása
Vell 25:7	folkeflandi fylkir
Sindr 5:7	salbrigðandi Sveigðis
Glúmr I, 2:3	blakkríðandi bakka
Eyv lv 5:7	gollhjǫltuðum galtar
Vell 36:3	herstefnandi hrǫfnum
Eg lv 14:7	Bergóneris / brúna
Húsdr 10:3	Hrafnfreistaðar / hesti
Korm lv 21:3	valkjósanda at vísu
Korm I, 6:3	fésæranda at fœra.

Type D1 is characterized by a tetrasyllabic compound of the form $\overline{SS}\breve{S}S$ or $\overline{SSSS}$ in positions 1-4. Position 4 is always occupied by an enclitic inflectional ending, and elision is possible in that position (e.g., Korm lv 21:3 *valkjósanda at vísu*, Korm I, 6:3 *fésæranda at fœra*; see Kuhn 1983:146). The internal rhymes fall in positions 1 (6 lines) and 2 (23 lines). Because no verb can occur in positions 1-4, the pattern is always sentence continuing (26 lines) or concluding (4 lines). Only two lines contain sentence boundaries (Eg lv 14:7, Húsdr 10:3), and in nineteen lines the compounds in positions 1-4 form a syntactic unit with the words in positions 5-6, either a nominal phrase (18 lines) or a verbal phrase (1 line).

If the whole line is occupied by a nominal phrase, that phrase is usually a *kenning* or part of a *kenning*. If we look at the structure of these phrases, however, the majority consist of so-called "inverted" *kenningar* (see Reichardt 1969), that is, the word in the cadence modifies the first element of the compound, and the ensuing nominal phrase serves as a qualifier for the base word that is contained in positions 2-4. The sequence, then, is Q^1+BW+Q^2, as the following examples show:

Haustl 12:3	*hug*reynandi ***Hœnis***
Haustl 18:3	*bǫl*verðungar ***Belja***
Jór 4:3	*tinglr*ýrǫndum ***tungla***
Sindr 5:7	*sal*brigðandi ***Sveigðis***
Glúmr I, 2:3	***blakk***ríðandi ***bakka***

Korm I, 4:3	*gla*ðfœðandi ***Gríðar***
Korm lv 25:7	*sǫng*varðaða *sverða*
Steinarr 2:7	*sár*geitunga *sveita*
Hást 1:3	*svip*njǫrðungar *sverða*
Vell 37:7	*log*skundaðar ***lindar***
Steinunn 2:3	*mǫg*fellandi ***Mellu***
Hfr I, 2:3	***hung****reyðǫndum **Hanga**
Hfr V, 16:3	***fúr****skerðandi *fjarðar*.

In other lines with nominal phrases in positions 1-6, however, that is not the case:

Haustl 5:7	ósvífrandi ása
TE 3:3	bǫðfíkinna bragna
Vell 25:7	folkeflandi fylkir
Hfr III, 28:7	margaukanda mækis (móts).

The answer to this riddle lies in the requirements imposed by alliteration and in the semantic properties of the compounds involved. West Germanic alliterative poetry distinguished between monosemantic and bisemantic compounds: whereas nonalliterating monosemantic (fused) compounds could occur after an alliterating qualifier (e.g., Hel 2585b *barno mancunnies*), bisemantic compounds could not (Hel 1396a *hoh holmklīƀu*; see Heusler 1956:110).[1] The same principle holds true for *dróttkvætt* poetry. The compounds that occupy positions 1-4 in D1-lines always have a monosemantic compound as second element, usually a *nomen agentis* (*-eflandi*, *-reynandi*, *-kannandi*, *-snerrandi*, *-ríðandi*, etc.). Thus the sequence occupying positions 1-4 behaves like the normal sequence ń+n. In the inverted *kenningar*, the first element of the tetrasyllabic compound functions as an independent element in a nominal phrase (*hugr Hœnis*, *bǫl Belja*, etc.). We have seen that in a sequence of three nomina the first must alliterate if it modifies the second, but if the second modifies the third, the second must also alliterate (Chap. 2, p. 37). In D1-lines, however, the second alliteration falls in position 5, which precludes syntactic unity between the nomen in positions 2-4 and the word in the cadence (†*reynandi Hœnis*). In the four lines without inversion, however, the compound in positions 1-4 is a "fused" compound, that is, a compound whose first element does not require further qualification (*ósvífrandi, margaukandi, folkeflandi, bǫðfíkinn*), and as such the whole compound can modify or be modified by the word in the cadence, with the regular sequence ń+ń (Q+BW or BW+Q).

The different treatment of monosemantic and bisemantic compounds also explains why there are no odd E1-lines in *dróttkvætt* poetry: in D1-lines, the second element in the tetrasyllabic compound is always monosemantic, usually a *nomen agentis*, or the entire compound is a personal name (*Bergóneris, Hrafnfreistaðar*). In E1-lines, however, *nomen agentis* constructions are not

possible owing to the syllabic structure of positions 2-4 (enclitic inflectional ending in position 3), and the compounds in positions 1-4 in the two even E1-lines (*Happ-þægibil, Hǫr-beiðisif*) consist of a qualifier (*Happ-, Hǫr-*) plus a bisemantic compound with a verbal first element. That accounts for the lack of odd E1-lines (and E2-lines) in *dróttkvætt*.

Kuhn maintained that there is always a syntactic caesura before the cadence in our Type D1 (Kuhn 1983:148). However, nineteen out of thirty lines have a syntactic unit in positions 1-6, and, moreover, the order of elements within those units (if nominal) is governed by restrictions of alliteration in position 5 and by the semantic character of the compounds in positions 1-4. Only two lines contain sentence boundaries, and there is no reason to assume that D1-lines were characterized by a syntactic break after position 4: rather, syntactic breaks seem to have been avoided in such lines.

Type D1 Odd is very common in encomiastic poetry, and in most cases the nominal filler accommodates *kenningar* or suspended parts of *kenningar* (frequently the subject). In eddic *fornyrðislag*, D1-lines are relatively rare, and nominal fillers only occur in "Hymisqviða" and the first Helgi lay: Hym 38:3 *goðmálugra*, HH I, 26:9 *vefnistingom*, HH I, 29:7 *stagstiórnmǫrom*. Other eddic D1-lines are occupied by adverbial fillers that have no counterparts in *dróttkvætt* lines (e.g., Grp 31:3 *fullfastliga*, Gǫr II, 17:7, 31:3 *brágiarnliga*).

Type D1 Even: (61 *lines*)   D1: ∥⌞×͜×⌟×o×

Eg lv 5:2	láðvarðaðar garði
Eg lv 41:2	þingbirtingar Ingva
Gldr 1:6	gnýstœrandi fœri
Eg lv 24:4	atsitjanda at vitja
Eg lv 32:6	logbrjótanda í móti
Eyv lv 13:4	sporðfjǫðruðum norðan
Eyv lv 4:2	veðrheyjandi skreyju
Korm lv 27:4	starreggjaðan Skeggi
Vell 29:2	leikmiðjungar / Þriðja
Eg lv 17:8	foldværingja / goldin.

Even lines of Type D1 have the same syllabic structure as odd lines. Elision can occur in position 4 (5 lines), and the internal rhymes fall in position 1 (16 lines) or 2 (44 lines) (see Kuhn 1983:164). Most even D1-lines are sentence concluding, or there is a discontinuity between the even and the following odd line (47 lines). Unlike odd D1-lines, which favored a nominal phrase in positions 1-6, only fourteen even lines have a nominal phrase in those positions: twenty lines have a verbal phrase (verb in the cadence); two have a prepositional phrase (preposition in

the cadence and elision); and the rest have no syntactic cohesion. There are only two sentence boundaries (Eg lv 17:8, Vell 29:2).

Most of the lines without syntactic coherence between position 4 and the cadence are sentence concluding:[2]

Haustl 9:8	Grjótníðaðar síðan
TE 4:4	ósmábornir gjarnir
Eg lv 17:8	foldværingja / goldin
Eg lv 33:6	ǫrmálgastan hjǫrva
Sindr 6:4	hlymmildingum gildir
Sindr 6:8	vápnunduðum sunda
Eyv lv 13:4	sporðfjǫðruðum norðan.

In these lines, the word in the cadence completes or modifies an earlier interrupted unit (*of kom síðan, eru gjarnir, get rán goldin, við ýti hjǫrva, af Nirði valbrands víðra landa sunda, sporna norðan*), thus creating a final release of syntactic tension (see D. Edwards 1983:166-75; Frank 1978:51). The lines without a syntactic unit in positions 1-6 which are not sentence concluding display a similar structure: the word in the cadence completes a disrupted syntactic unit and, as in the previous group, there is no immediate syntactic connection between the even line and the following odd line. Consider the following examples:[3]

Eg lv 26:5-6	*arfstóli* knák *Ála* ‖ áttgǫfguðum *hattar*
Eg lv 31:1-2	*fyrir* þykki mér fúra ‖ fleinstøkkvandi *nøkkvat*
Eyv lv 4:1-2	*baðat* valgrindar *vinda* ‖ veðrheyjandi *skreyju*
Eyv lv 11:1-2	*skyldak* skerja foldar ‖ skíðrennandi *síðan*
Gráf 6:5-6	*valgaltar* lét velta ‖ vargfœðandi *marga*
Korm lv 14:1-2	hneit *við Hrungnis fóta* ‖ hallvitjǫndum *stalli*
Vell 29:1-2	*þrymr* varð *lǫgs* / (þars lǫgðu ‖ leikmiðjungar) / *Þriðja*.

This principle accords well with our earlier observations about sentence boundaries before the cadence in even E-lines: such sentence boundaries must be marked by the syntactic filler in position 4 (pronominal, adverbial) and/or occur in the last line of the *helmingr* (sentence concluding). In the latter case, the word in the cadence completes a sentence from an earlier line and releases the tension created by earlier syntactic disruption, as in the following stanzas (Types D1, E3, E4):

Eg lv 17:5-6	*nærgis simla sorgar*
	slík rán ek get hánum
	(vér deildum fjǫl foldar
	foldværingja) / *goldin*;

Eg V, 1-4 *mál es lofs at lýsa*
ljósgarð / es þák / *barða*
(mér kom heim at hendi
hoddsendis boð) / *enda*;

Steing 1:1-4 *brœðr mynda ek blindum*
bauglestir mik festa
(yrði goð / sem gerðisk
góð mér ok skǫp) / *Fróða*.

Syntactic interruption after position 4 in even D1-lines then, proceeded according to fixed patterns that involved syntactic framing. Such breaks (sentence boundaries as well as the lack of syntactic unity) occur in clause-final position, and the word in the cadence completes an earlier interrupted unit, belonging either to the same sentence (no sentence boundary) or to another sentence (sentence boundary after position 4). However, sentence boundaries are rare in even D1-lines (2 lines) and more than 50 percent of such lines have a syntactic unit in postions 1-6, so I cannot concur with Kuhn's contention that our Type D1 always contained a syntactic break before the cadence (Kuhn 1983:96).

Only two even D1-lines contain inverted *kenningar*, namely, Eg lv 41:2 *þingbirtingar Ingva* and Þmáhl 5:6 *sóknmiðjungar Þriðja*. Because position 5 in even lines did not alliterate, the creation of inverted *kenningar* was not necessitated by requirements of alliteration, as in odd lines. But some skalds were clearly aware of the artistic quality of such constructions, and they employed them in even lines as well. The most famous example of an inverted *kenning* in an even line is the C-line Eg lv 6:4 *í dalmiskunn fiska*, in which the second element of the compound is the base word and the first element modifies the nomen in the cadence (*miskunn dal-fiska* 'the mercy of the valley fish [snakes],' that is, "summer"]). Thus it is not a coincidence that one of the inverted *kenningar* in even D1-lines belongs to Egill, who used it in a lament for his deceased friend, Arinbjǫrn (Eg lv 41:2 *þingbirtingar Ingva*).

As in odd lines, the compound in positions 2-4 is monosemantic. Only two lines, TE 4:4 *ósmábornir gjarnir* and Korm lv 36:8 *Gollseimnjǫrun heima*, seem to defy this principle. The first has internal rhyme in position 3, which is highly irregular, and, in the second example, positions 1-2 are occupied by a compound that modifies the nomen in positions 3-4 (*Gollseim-njǫrun*; so also *ósmá-bornir*?). In even lines, some of the compounds in positions 1-4 are adverbial, rather than nominal (Korm lv 48:4 *ómissila þissa*, GSúrs 35:6 *allskyndila byndi*, Hfr V, 25:2 *alldrengila fengit*), and, in that respect, they resemble such eddic constructions as Gǫr II, 17:7, 31:3 *þrágiarnliga*.

Relatively few even lines of Type D2 occur in panegyrics (15 lines only). The type is prominent in Egill's poetry (10 lines), and his *lausavísur* also contain one of the two lines with a sentence boundary before the cadence (cf. the syntactic

organization of Egill's E3-lines). In eddic *fornyrðislag* there are more even than odd D1-lines, and they are fairly evenly distributed (but no lines from "Vǫlospá"): Hym 7:6 *horngǫfgasta*, Hym 35:8 *fiǫlhǫfðaða*, Þrk 13:8 *vergiarnasta*, HH II, 27:6 *grimmúðgastan*, Grp 39:6 *framlundaða*, Fm 41:4 *fólclíðondom*, Sg 20:4 *ófróðara*, Hlr 11:2 *gullmiðlandi*, Gǫr II, 30:2 *ættgǫfgastan*, Od 2:6 *stiórnbitloðom*, Ghv 1:2 *slíðrfengligsta*. Unlike *dróttkvætt* lines, however, some eddic lines contain the prohibited sequence S̆ S̆ S̆ in positions 2-4: Sg 35:6, 39:10 *þióðkonungar*, Ghv 3:10, 6:2 *Húnkonunga*, Ghv 14:4 *þióðkonungi* (see Kuhn 1939:212-13).

Type D2 Odd: (8 lines)   D2: //S̆ S̆×//×

Rdr 5:3	segls naglfara siglur
Korm I, 7:3	ýs bifvangi Yngva
Korm lv 16:3	eins karls synir inni
Korm lv 20:5	segðu aldrigi síðan
Korm lv 40:7	dýr skǫfnunga drafnar
GSúrs 14:7	veðrs Skjǫldunga valdi
Bbreiðv 1:7	opt horfinnar erfi
Tindr II, 1:3	veðr Bǫðgerðar virða.

Type D2 is clearly avoided in odd lines. Two lines are irregular (Korm lv 16:3, 20:5), and the interpretation of another is uncertain (Korm lv 40:7; see Frank 1970). Those lines are not included in the following discussion. Three lines have a nominal phrase in positions 1-6, and two of these involve inverted *kenningar* (Rdr 5:3 *segls naglfara siglur*, GSúrs 14:7 *veðrs Skjǫldunga valdi*). In both cases the base word occupies the cadence, and it is modified by the word in position 1, which again is modified by the monosemantic compound in positions 1-4: *siglur segls naglfara*, *valdi veðrs Skjǫldunga*. The third line with a nominal phrase in positions 1-6 has an adjective in positions 1-4, modifying the noun in the cadence: Bbreiðv 1:7 *opt horfinnar erfi* (= Vell 25:7 *folkeflandi fylkir*). In the remaining two lines, there is no syntactic coherence between the words in position 4 and the cadence, but positions 1-4 are occupied by a nominal phrase (*ýs bifvangi*, *veðr Bǫðgerðar*). The compounds are usually monosemantic (*naglfari*, *aldrigi*, *skǫfnungr*, *Skjǫldungar*, *horfinn*), and only *Bǫðgerðr* and *bifvangr* could be classified as bisemantic. However, it is possible that the first compound could have been treated as a personal name, in which case it would have been monosemantic and need not alliterate. In the second compound, the verbal first element (*bif*) does not function as a verbal qualifier of a *kenning*, as in *Hristisif hringa*, it merely qualifies the second element (*bifvangr = bifrandi vangr*), and may not have fulfilled the requirements for bisemantic status.

The inverted *kenningar* in our Type D2 Odd puzzled Kuhn (Kuhn 1983:147). However, it is clear that they, like the monosemantic compounds in positions 2-4

in our Types D1-2, which Kuhn also was at a loss to explain (ibid.), owed their existence to requirements imposed by alliteration in positions 1 and 5 (cf. the discussion of D1, above).

With the exception of Kormákr's *lausavísa* 20:5, all D2-lines are sentence continuing. The internal rhymes occupy positions 1 (2 lines), 2 (3 lines), and 3 (2 lines). Lines with internal rhymes in position 3 have no counterparts in D1-lines, in which the rhyme fell in either position 1 or 2. Such odd lines characterize Snorri's *dróttkvætt* variant *bragarbót* (Ht 31; 'restoration of poetry' [?], *SnE* I:642), in which the first alliterating stave occupies position 1 and the internal rhymes are so close that only one syllable separates them (see Kuhn 1983:147). If the internal rhyme falls in position 3, all the compounds consist of a short first syllable followed by a long (*bifvangr*, *Bǫðgerðr*). That structure cannot have been fortuitous, and it most likely resulted from the attempt to divert attention from the first, nonalliterating syllable. We know, of course, nothing about how such compounds were stressed, but the conditions are comparable to those of E3-4 *detthent* lines, in which compounds of the same structure ($\breve{S}\bar{S}S$ with internal rhymes on the second syllable) occupied positions 3-6.

Odd *fornyrðislag* lines of our Type D2 are quite common, and in most cases they have double alliteration in positions 1 and 2, as is shown by the following lines from "Vǫlospá":

Vsp 21:9	opt, ósialdan
Vsp 33:7	vá Valhallar
Vsp 35:7	ver velglýiuð
Vsp 39:3	menn meinsvara
Vsp 40:7	tungls tiúgari
Vsp 51:5	fara fífls megir
Vsp 62:7	vel, valtívar.

In eddic lines with double alliteration, the words in positions 1-4 need not form a syntactic unit, but if only position 1 alliterates, positions 1-4 are occupied by a nominal phrase (HHj 10:3 *fólcs oddviti*) or a verbal phrase (Hym 27:1 *gecc Hlórriði*, Hym 33:5 *Týr leitaði*). In such lines, the compound in positions 2-4 is always monosemantic, as in *dróttkvætt* lines with similar structure.

Type D2 Even: (210 lines)   D2: $/\!/\bar{\breve{8}}\breve{8}\times$o$\times$

Haustl 3:6	már valkastar báru
Rdr 5:4	saums andvanar standa
Korm lv18:8	linns þjóðáar rinna
Vell 28:6	fór Gunnviðurr sunnan
GSúrs 22:4	blíð / lofskreyti ríða

Rdr 13:4	rauk / Danmarkar auka
Vell 17:4	Vík / Hákonar ríki
Rdr 19:2	vágs hyrsendir ægi
Vell 28:8	vágs blakkriði / Frakka
Vell 16:4	ríkr / ásmegir / slíku.

Type D2 is very common in even lines, and only Types E4 (235 lines) and A2k (294 lines) occur more frequently. Lines of this type are predominantly sentence concluding or continuing, but if a finite verb occupies position 1, they can also be sentence introductory (e.g., Gldr 5:6 *réð egglituðr / seggir*, Haustl 16:4 *brann upphiminn / manna*). Positions 1-6 can be filled by a nominal phrase (Haustl 3:6 *már valkastar báru*) or a verbal phrase (Þmáhl 7:4 *þings spámeyjar singva*), but, in most lines, the words in positions 2-6 form a syntactic unit (Eyv lv 8:4 *fræ Hákonar ævi*, Sindr 5:4 *austr geðbœti hraustan*, Eg lv 12:6 *ræðr gunnvala bræðir*). Some lines have a syntactic unit in positions 1-4 (Hildr 1:6 *Yggs valbríkar slíkan*, Eg lv 6:2 *ulfs tannlituðr glitra*), and it is clear that even D2-lines can have the structure S+SSSSS (*land / beiðaðarreiði*: e.g., Gráf 9:4 *garðs Eylimafjarðar*, Hfr V, 4:4 *hvars Akkerisfrakki*) as well as SSSS+SS (*land / beiðaðar / reiði*), but the first is much more common (see Kuhn 1983:164, 173-74).

The syntactic divisions above are borne out by the distribution of sentence boundaries: forty-three sentence boundaries fall after position 1 and only fourteen fall before the cadence. As in the earlier instances of sentence boundaries after position 1, the internal rhymes always occur in initial position: if there is a sentence boundary after position 4, the internal rhyme can occupy positions 1 or 2, as in the following examples: Gldr 5:8 *hnigu fjǫrvanir / sigri*, Haustl 13:2 *skǫpt ginnregin / brinna*, Gldr 5:6 *réð egglituðr / seggir*. This distribution of internal rhymes also coincides with the syntactic divisions observed above: if positions 1-6 or 1-4 form a syntactic unit, positions 1, 2, or 3 can rhyme; if a syntactic unit occupies positions 2-4, the internal rhyme falls in position 1. Consider the following examples:

Syntactic unit positions 1-4 (1-6)		*Syntactic unit positions 2-4*	
Rdr 5:4	saums andvanar standa	Korm lv 64:8	Gerðr strádauða verða
Kveld 1:6	Þórs fangvina at ganga	Vell 33:4	hljót Yggs mjaðar njóta
Eg lv 6:2	ulfs tannlituðr glitra	Korm lv 50:8	sverð fordœðu gerðu
Hildr 1:6	Yggs valbríkar slíkan	Rdr 8:8	baug ørlygis draugi
Eg lv 5:6	þrír nakkvarir Hlakkar	Hást 6:4	sundr gráklæði Þundar
Eskál I, 1:6	Ullr geirvaðils þeira	Vell 6:4	hljóð fleyjǫfurs þjóðir
Vell 28:6	fór Gunnviðurr sunnan	Rdr 18:4	hekk Vǫlsunga drekku
ÓTr 1:4	hérs Akkerisfrakki.	Haustl 19:8	stóð Einriða blóði.

We see then, that the placement of internal rhymes in D2-lines not only served to mark sentence boundaries (after position 1), but also to delineate the syntactic organization of the line. Resolution in position 1 and syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2 seem to have fulfilled a similar function: if there is a sentence boundary after position 1, a monosyllabic long syllable occupies position 1, and, conversely, resolution and syllabic cohesion only occur in lines with syntactic units in positions 1-4 (e.g., Gldr 5:8 *hnigu fjǫrvanir* / *sigri*, Eg lv 38:6 *tíu launstafi ristna*, Korm lv 32:4 *gefin tindráttar manni*, HolmgB 11:6 *litak aldrigi bitran*, Eg lv 3:6 *vel glýjaðra þýja*, GSúrs 2:2 *es bál mikit* / *skála*, Vell 23:4 *sjau landrekar randa*).[4]

Most lines with a sentence boundary after position 4 are sentence concluding, and, in fourteen out of fifteen lines, the word in the cadence completes an earlier interrupted clause. The remaining line belongs to a *helmingr* from "Glymdrápa" which contains two lines with a sentence boundary after position 4:

>
> Gldr 5:5-8   þás á rausn fyr ræsi
>   (réð egglituðr) / seggir
>   (æfr gall hjǫrr við hlífar)
>   hnigu fjǫrvanir / (sigri).

On the whole, the skalds had a tendency to use clusters of even D2-lines in their stanzas, and this could mean that they consciously or unconsciously tried to regularize the rhythm in their stanzas and *helmingar*, especially in sentence-final position.[5]

Four lines contain two sentence boundaries, and three of those lines are from encomiastic poetry: Vell 12:2 *harðr* / *Lopts vinar* / *barða*, Vell 16:4 *ríkr* / *ásmegir* / *slíku*, and Hfr III, 26:4 *norðr* / *guðfǫður* / *orðinn*, versus Korm lv 15:4 *hǫll* / *þverligar* / *alla*. In all these lines the internal rhyme occurs in position 1 and the word in initial position belongs to the same sentence as the word in the cadence (*harðr barða, ríkr slíku, norðr orðinn, hǫll alla*). Three of the four lines conclude the *helmingr*, and, in Vell 12:2, the compound in positions 2-4 is part of a *kenning* that belongs to a clause that is introduced in the following odd line (*því kom vǫxtr í Vínu // vínheims* [*Lopts vinar*]), in which the verbal echoes (*vinar, Vínu, vín-heims*) must have emphasized the connection between the disrupted elements.

In even D2-lines, many of the compounds in positions 2-4 that are modified by the word in position 1 are not monosemantic but bisemantic (e.g., Rdr 19:2 *vágs hyrsendir ægi*, Eg lv 6:2 *ulfs tannlituðr glitra*), and, as in E2 Even, we also find the sequence v́+n (Gldr 5:8 *hnigu fjǫrvanir* / *sigri*) that was impossible in odd lines. Thus the restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd lines did not apply in even lines (see also Kuhn 1983:174), and this had consequences not only for the syntactic filler (verb in position 1) but also for the placement of sentence boundaries (the words in positions 1 and 2-4 need not form a syntactic unit).

As in odd D2-lines, position 3 in even lines could carry internal rhyme:

Bragi II, 1:2	aptr Þrívalda haldit
Hildr 1:6	Yggs valbríkar slíkan
Eg lv 6:2	ulfs tannlituðr glitra
Eg lv 6:8	seið ófagran vigra
Eg lv 33:2	blár Dragvandill randir
Korm lv 18:2	mér ásjánu þína
GSúrs 16:2	vés ótyrrinn / fyrri.

Except for Eg lv 6:2, all the compounds consist of a short syllable followed by a long. Snorri called such lines *riðhent* ('lines with swinging or bridging rhymes'; Ht 32, *SnE* I: 642-44), but in his model stanza these lines are distinguished by a syntactic unit in positions 2-6, rather than in positions 1-4 (6 lines), as in early *dróttkvætt*: Ht 32:2 *skýs snarvinda lindar*, Ht 32:4 *hræs dynbrunnum runnin*, Ht 32:6 *snjallr ilstafna hrafni*, Ht 32:8 *fram þrábarni arnar*. Three of the seven lines with internal rhymes in position 3 belong to Egill's *lausavísur*, and Snorri cannot have been ignorant of that fact: in his *fornskaldahœttir* (meters of ancient skalds), he mentions *riðhent* as one of the characteristics of Egill's poetry (Ht 56: *SnE* I:670). However, he also claims that Torf-Einarr used *riðhent* in his poems, and in the surviving corpus of Torf-Einarr's stanzas (TE 1-5) there are even C-lines and one D1-line with internal rhymes in position 3, but no D2-lines (cf. Ht 55; *SnE* I: 668).[6] We can infer from this that, whereas Snorri must have been familiar with the peculiarities of Egill's poems as they are preserved in *Egils saga*, he either knew poems by Torf-Einarr which are no longer extant, or he assumed that his audience did not know Torf-Einarr's production and indulged in a small deception to preserve the natural progression of his poetic exegesis.[7]

Even D2-lines were common from the earliest *dróttkvætt* (Bragi 10, Þjóð 12), and the type was particularly popular with Kormákr (33 lines), Einarr skálaglamm (24 lines), and Þórarinn máhliðingr (10 lines). In eddic *fornyrðislag*, D2-lines also occur frequently. Unlike *dróttkvætt* lines, eddic D2-lines could contain present participles and compound verbs in positions 2-4 (Vsp 47:2 *ascr standandi*, 66:2 *dreki fliúgandi*, 1:6 *vel fyrtelia*), but often the compounds in positions 2-4 are the same in eddic and skaldic poetry, as in the following lines:

Eddic		*Skaldic*	
Vsp 30:12	grund, valkyrior:	Húsdr 9:2	sylgs valkyrjur fylgja
Vsp 33:4	Baldrs andscota:	Korm lv 16:2	sín andskotar mínar
Vsp 56:2	mǫgr Hlóðyniar:	Vst 2:4	gein Hlǫðvinjar beina
HH I, 27:4	rero víkingar:	Þmáhl 13:6	frán víkinga mána
HH II, 12:2	fólcs oddviti:	Eg lv 34:8	slíkr / oddvita ríki
Grp 19:4	gestr þióðkonungs:	Gldr 7:4	sverð þjóðkonungs ferðar
Grp 49:6	grand aldregi:	Hfr III, 28:8	móts aldrigi bótir
Gðr I, 3:6	sinn oftrega:	Eg lv 38:8	langs ofrtrega fengit.

These examples conveniently illustrate the most conspicuous difference between the structure of eddic *fornyrðislag* and skaldic *dróttkvætt*, namely, the additional two syllables in the cadence of *dróttkvætt* lines with which the compound more often than not forms a syntactic unit.

Type A2k Odd: (8 lines)   A2k: $\sslash\!\breve{\bar{\times}}\!\times\!\times\!\sslash\!\times$

Gldr 7:3	svartskyggð bitu seggi
Eg lv 34:5	Arinbjǫrn hefir árnat
HolmgB 10:5	lifspell biðu lýðir
GSúrs 26:5	allvaldr hefir aldar
ÞHjalt 2:5	þat eitt lifir þeira
EVald 1:3	hornstraum getum Hrímnis
Þjsk I, 1:1	Hákon vitum hvergi
Eil III, 1:1	setbergs kveða sitja.

Odd lines of Type A2k are rare (see Kuhn 1983:140). Because of the restrictions imposed by alliteration in position 5, they always have the same structure, namely, a disyllabic compound of the form SS followed by a disyllabic bimoric verb (Craigie's law). The verb in positions 3-4 usually forms a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence, either v+inf. (*kveða sitja*), v+part. II (*hefir árnat*), v+adv. (*vitum hvergi*), v+S (*biðu lýðir*), or v+O (*bitu seggi, lifir þeira*). In two lines, the word in the cadence modifies the compound in positions 1-2, but not in the manner of an inverted kenning: *allvaldr aldar, hornstraum Hrímnis*. The lines are always sentence introductory, and the verb occupies an $\breve{\times}$-position as the second element in the sentence (= prose).

According to Kuhn, lines of our Type A2k were separated by a syntactic caesura before the cadence, and he maintains that the finite verb in positions 3-4 belongs syntactically to the word in positions 1-2 (Kuhn 1983:140-41). However, as Kuhn also noted (Kuhn 1983:141), none of these lines contains sentence boundaries, and, moreover, they normally have a syntactic unit in positions 3-6. In Eilífr's line, for example, the word in positions 1-2 is a genitive (adverbial) that does not belong syntactically to the following verb *kveða*, and, in Þórleifr's praise poem to Earl Hákon, the first two positions are occupied by a vocative (*Hákon*), followed by a verbal phrase (*vitum hvergi*). We see then, that the structure of odd A2k-lines resembles that of the other sentence-introductory lines examined in Chapter 4. Sentence boundaries were avoided in such lines, and, if possible, the word in the cadence formed a syntactic unit with the word in position 4 or 3-4 (E3-4, XE3-4, B).

The internal rhymes occupy position 1 or 2, and they appear to have had no specific function in delineating the syntax. The placement of the subject is again

predictable, and it occurs proclitically to the verb (4 lines), in the cadence immediately following the verb (1 line), or it is suppressed and signaled by the form of the verb (*getum*, *vitum*, *kveða*).

There are no XA2k-lines with alliteration in positions 3 and 5 (†*mjǫk rauð staða Stikla*), and the reason could be a that a disyllabic bimoric syllable must be resolved if it carried the first alliterating stave (see such eddic lines as Vsp 9:7 *ór Brimis blóði*). In odd *fornyrðislag* lines, Type A2k is not subject to restrictions imposed by alliteration in positions 1 and 5. The filler of positions 3-4 is frequently nominal, and double alliteration (positions 1 and 3) is common. Such lines are not sentence introductory, but sentence continuing or concluding (e.g., Vsp 1:7 *forn spiǫll fira*, Vsp 37:7 *biórsalr iǫtuns*, Hym 4:7 *ástráð mikit*, Hym 5:3 *hundvíss Hymir*, HH I, 8:7 *blóðorm búinn*, HH I, 30:7 *giálfrdýr konungs*, Grp 23:7 *naddéls boði*, Rm 23:7 *hiǫrleics hvatir*, Fm 43:7 *hǫrgefn hali*). Only a few eddic lines are sentence introductory and contain a finite verb in positions 3-4, such as the following lines: Vsp 52:5 *griótbiǫrg gnata*, Rm 16:5 *seglvigg ero*, Rm 17:7 *hlunnvigg hrapa*, Od 34:5 *maðr hverr lifir*.

Type A2k Even: (294 lines)   A2k: //⅛×̄×o×

Rdr 3:6	Randvés hǫfuðniðja
Eg I, 1:4	hǫfuðbaðmr þría jǫfra
Haustl 4:6	vígfrekr ofan sígask
Gráf 11:4	auðván / Haralds dauði
Haustl 6:8	herfangs ofan stǫngu
Gráf 10:4	geirdrótt Haraldr þeiri
Korm I, 1:4	jastrín / Haralds / mína
Gldr 8:6	allr herr Skota þverri
Hást 7:2	sigrstalls viðir falla
Haustl 9:4	áttrunnr Hymis / kunni.

Type A2k is the most frequently found pattern in even *dróttkvætt* lines (see Kuhn 1983:166, 174-75). There are no restrictions on the filler of positions 3-4, and those positions can be occupied by a noun (Eg I, 2:2 *hreinbraut Aðalsteini*, Eg lv 8:4 *víkingr / Dana ríki*), by an adjective (Eyv lv 2:2 *naddregns hvǫtum þegni*), by an adverb (Glúmr I, 2:4 *barnungr þaðan farna*), by a verb (Korm lv 29:6 *hǫrfit munak sitja*, Korm lv 6:6 *mengrund komit stundum*), or by a preposition (Haustl 3:2 *tálhreinn meðal beina*).[8]

The pattern is sentence continuing or concluding, but in some lines the words in positions 1-2, 3-6, or 5-6 introduce a new clause (with a hard sentence boundary) as in the following examples:

Gldr 8:2-3	(margspakr) / Niðar varga ‖ lundr vann sókn á sandi
Korm lv 27:2-3	(morðvǫnd) / fetils storðar ‖ staðr esa strandar naðri
Gráf 3:6-7	(sverðleiks reginn) / ferðir ‖ sendi gramr at grundu
Eg lv 22:2-3	vígleiptr / (sonar heiptir ‖ Blóðøxar) / rauðk blóði
Eg lv 45:6-7	orð mín / (konungr forðum) ‖ hafði gramr at gamni
Korm lv 35:2-3	landvǫrðr / (saman randir) ‖ várat virðar stœri
Þmáhl 2:2-3	hræflóð / (bragar Móða) ‖ rauk of sóknar sœki.

Seventy-two lines contain sentence boundaries. Sixty-five sentence boundaries occur after position 2, five after position 4, and two lines have two sentence boundaries. Type A2k, then, is syntactically organized as SS+SSSS (*landbeið / aðarreiði*), SS+SS+SS, or SSSS+SS (*landbeið / aðar / reiði*). Most even A2k-lines have a syntactic unit in position 3-6, either a nominal phrase (which is by far the most common) or a verbal phrase. The usual order of constituents in these nominal phrases is Q+BW (VGl 5:2 *harðgeðr Limafjarðar*, Vell 23:6 *eggþings Heðins veggjar*), but the order BW+Q is also possible, and it occurs in around 40 percent of the nominal phrases (Korm lv 56:6 *orð mín Skǫgul borða;* see also Kuhn 1933:70, 1983:175).

Lines with two sentence boundaries or sentence boundaries before the cadence usually occupy the the last line of the *helmingr*, or the words in positions 1-4 conclude a sentence:

Haustl 9:4	áttrunnr Hymis / kunni
Haustl 10:8	hamljót regin / gamlar
Vell 34:4	gunndjarfr Búi / sunnan
Korm I, 1:4	jastrín / Haralds / mína
Þmáhl 4:8	hnigreyr / lǫgum / dreyra
Eyv lv 1:5-6	(heldr es vant) / en vildak ‖ veg þinn konungr / (segja)
Gráf 3:5-6	slíðrtungur lét syngva ‖ sverðleiks reginn / (ferðir).

If the line has no sentence boundary and there is no syntactic unit in positions 3-6, either the lines are *helmingr*-final or the word in the cadence completes a syntactic unit from the previous odd line. Consider the following examples:[9]

Gldr 8:5-6	áðr *fyr eljunprúðum* ‖ allr herr Skota *þverri*
Eg lv 10:1-2	*gekk* / (sás óðisk ekki) ‖ jarlmanns bani *snarla*
Sindr 2:1-2	almdrósar *fór* eisu ‖ élrunnr mǫrum *sunnan*
Eyv lv 6:1-2	fyrr rauð *Fenris varra* ‖ flugvarr konungr *sparra*
Gráf 7:5-6	víðlendr *of bað vinda* ‖ verðung Haraldr *sverðum*
HolmgB 1:5-6	*skora mun* Skǫglar dýra ‖ skjaldveðrs reginn *aldri*
Hást 1:5-6	(hygg) / at halfir *liggi* ‖ heptendr laga *eptir*
GSúrs 19:1-2	sagt hefk enn *frá órum* ‖ oddflaums viðum *draumi*
Hfr II, 1:1-2	*tolf* vas elds at aldri ‖ ýsetrs hati *vetra*
Hfr II, 8:5-6	*eyddi* ulfa greddir ‖ ógnblíðr Skotum *víða*.

This framing pattern is familiar from our earlier discussion, and it must have belonged to a set of conventional devices that the skalds used in their composition of *dróttkvætt* poetry. A similar framing effect can be detected in lines with a syntactic unit in positions 3-6, too, but owing to the number of constituents contained in these positions, the syntax tends to be more transparent.

The compound in positions 1-2 can accommodate parts of a *kenning* (BW or Q: Rdr 13:8 *vallrauf / fjogur haufuð*, Haustl 6:8 *herfangs ofan stǫngu*), an adjectival attributive (Rdr 17:4 *harðgeðr neðan starði*), or a personal name (Eg lv 11:6 *Áleifr þrimu stála*). Such bipartite compounds contained both rhyme and alliteration, and, because each element of the compound usually could be replaced by a number of synonyms, they were eminently suited as accommodators for the more semantically pregnant and unchangeable elements in the cadence. In Hallfreðr's eulogy to King Óláfr Tryggvason, for example, the king's patronymic is accommodated by two adjectives with the same second element providing the internal rhyme and with an interchangeable first element that provided the necessary alliteration (Hfr III, 19:4; 25:8 *flugstyggs sonar Tryggva*, Hfr III, 22:4 *læstyggs sonar Tryggva*). A similar tendency can be observed in such even E3-lines as Húsdr 1:2 *herreifum Áleifi*, Hfr III, 10:4 *folkreifum Áleifi*, Hfr III, 29:2 *hugreifum Áleifi*. These nominal compounds provided the skalds with a very important compositional tool, and skalds used them both to achieve poetic effects (as part of individualized *kenningar*) and as metrical fillers to accommodate rhyme and alliteration.

The nomina that occupy positions 3-4 must be bimoric, and the only other position in which they can occur in a *dróttkvætt* line is position 1, with resolution. The various forms of the word *konungr* (king), for example, are almost exclusively delegated to this position (15 lines), as are the name Haraldr (9 lines) and the ethnic name of the Norwegian archenemy, the *Danir* (4 lines). Consider the following examples from the late ninth and early tenth centuries:

Gldr 9:2	annarr konungmanna
Eg I, 1:8	hrannbrjótr / konungmanni
Eg lv 45:6	orð mín / konungr forðum
Sindr 1:2	blárǫst konungr árum
Eyv lv 1:6	veg þinn konungr / segja
Gldr 9:4	gnapstól Haraldr sólar
Eg lv 24:6	snarrþátt Haralds áttar
Eyv lv 2:8	gunnborð / Haraldr sunnan
Eyv lv 7:8	fullegg Haraldr gullu
Gráf 7:6	verðung Haraldr sverðum
Eg lv 8:4	víkingr / Dana ríki
Sindr 2:6	allreiðr Dana skeiðar
Eyv lv 5:8	grandaðr Dana brandi.

If the nominal phrase in positions 3-6 contains a *kenning* or part of a *kenning* that belongs to the semantic sphere of "battle," the choice of qualifier could be somewhat limited. In "Vellekla," for example, five such *kenningar* have the qualifier *Heðins* (Vell 7:6 *Heðins bóga*, 22:8 *Heðins byrjar*, 23:6 *Heðins veggjar*, 30:4 *Heðins váða*, 37:6 *Heðins reikar*), and similar constructions occur in the poetry of other skalds (Hróm 2:6 *Heðins fitjar*, VGl 11:4 *Heðins drífu*, Hfr III, 11:4 *Heðins rekka*). Because of the syllabic restrictions on the nomen in positions 3-4, the filler of those positions is usually quite stereotyped, and, in addition to the words already mentioned, the most common are the nominative and oblique forms of the following nouns: *sonr* ('son,' 10 lines), *faðir* ('father,' 5 lines), *vinr / vina* ('friend,' 6 lines), *reginn* ('god,' 5 lines), *goð* ('gods,' 5 lines).

Both "Ragnarsdrápa" (6 lines) and "Haustlǫng" (14 lines) contain even A2k-lines, and lines of this type are common in encomiastic poetry as well as in *lausavísur*. They occur with high frequency in the poetry of Þjóðólfr (16 lines), Egill (32 lines), Eyvindr (17 lines), Hásteinn (10 lines), Þórarinn máhliðingr (12 lines), and in Hallfreðr's "Erfidrápa" (22). Like even D2-lines, A2k-lines, too, are often clustered in the same stanzas, and, as Egill's panegyric to King Aðalsteinn demonstrated (Chap. 4, p. 91), the poets were clearly aware of the effects they could achieve by systematically employing such lines throughout their poems.[10] In Eyvindr's *lausavísa* 5, for example, all the even lines are A2k-lines, and they contain both of the stereotyped fillers *konungr* and *Danir*:

<div>

Eyv lv 5

veitk at beit enn bitri
byggving meðaldyggvan
bulka skíðs ór báðum
benvǫndr konungs hǫndum;
ófælinn klauf Ála
éldraugr skarar haugar
gollhjǫltuðum galtar
grandaðr Dana brandi.

</div>

Even A2k-lines are quite common in eddic *fornyrðislag* and, as the following comparison shows, the fillers are the same as in *dróttkvætt* lines:

Eddic		*Skaldic*	
Hym 31:6	hiálmstofn ofan:	GSúrs 34:8	hjalmstofn ofan klofna
Sg 2:6	dœgr mart saman:	Korm lv 41:4	fimm nætr saman grimmar
HH I, 21:2	allvaldr þaðan:	Glúmr I, 2:4	barnungr þaðan farna
Sg 69:6	ferð mín heðan:	Þjóð IV, 2:2	flatvǫllr heðan batnar
HH I, 7:4	góð ár komin:	Þjsk III, 1:4	naðrbings kominn hingat
HH I, 11:4	Hundings synir:	Tindr II, 2:4	Guðbrands synir handan
HH I, 20:2	Ísungs bana:	Hfr V, 13:8	Auðgísls bana dauðan
HHj 10:2	heilráðr konungr:	Hfr I, 5:2	snjallráðr konungs spjalli.

Type A2k Verbal Even: (22 lines)   A2k: $\not\!/\breve{\mathsf{x}}\breve{\mathsf{x}}\times\mathsf{o}\times$

Eg lv 40:4	varðk einn bani þeira
Jór 1:2	beið herr konungs reiði
Korm lv 48:2	trúir mannr konu annars
Stefnir 1:2	erumk leið fǫður reiði
Hfr V, 9:6	erumk leið sonar reiði
Hfr V, 19:6	sofa karms meðal arma
Vell 1:2	heyr jarl Kvasis dreyra
Vst 1:2	mérs fundr gefinn Þundar
HolmgB 7:2	fersk ván gleði / þessum
Þmáhl 4:2	þegi herr meðan / segja.

Even lines of Type A2k Verbal usually contain the sequence v+n in positions 1-2, and only four lines have a pronominal or an adverbial filler in position 2. Because of the initial prohibited sequence v́+n, there are no odd lines of this type. The lines are sentence introductory (with the exception of Hást lv 7:6 and Hfr V, 19:6), and the words in positions 3-6 often form a syntactic unit, either a nominal phrase (13 lines) or a verbal phrase (4 lines). Three lines have a participle in positions 3-4, and the nomen in the cadence modifies the nomen in position 2 (Vst 1:2 *mérs fundr gefinn Þundar*, Þmáhl 6:2 *varð ár drifin sára*, Þmáhl 15:6 *hérs fjón komin ljóna*). The internal rhymes tend to occupy position 2 (14 lines), and four lines have no rhymes.

Only two lines contain sentence boundaries, one of which has an adverb in positions 3-4 (Þmáhl 4:2 *þegi herr meðan / segja*), but usually the lines consist of a single uninterrupted parenthetic clause. Resolution in initial position occurs quite often (12 out of 22 lines), and the difference in the number of resolved initial syllables in A2k (2 percent) and A2k Verbal (54.5 percent) must be related to the nature of the syntactic fillers: we have seen that resolution most likely originated in the attempt to accommodate disyllabic bimoric verbs in initial position and that nomina were rarely resolved (Chap. 3, p. 64). All the resolved syllables in position 1, A2k Verbal, are verbs, whereas in Type A2k the initial position was occupied by a nomen. That accounts for the high number of resolved syllables in sentence-introductory lines of Types E2 Verbal (19 percent), E3 Verbal Odd (23 percent), E4 Verbal Even (10 percent), and XE4 (20 percent) with a verb in initial position, and it also explains the relation between sentence boundaries and resolution: lines with a verb (resolved) in initial position were sentence introductory, and sentence boundaries were avoided in such lines.

The content of the parenthetic clauses in A2k Verbal-lines is stereotyped. Verbal repetition occurs frequently, and the nominal fillers of positions 3-4 tend to belong to the high-frequency fillers of Type A2k Even. Consider the following examples:

Eg lv 40:4	varðk einn bani þeira
Korm lv 16:4	erut þeir banar mínir
Korm lv 36:2	skulum tveir banar þeira
Hást 6:6	hlutu þeir bana fleiri
TE 1:4	dugir oss fǫður hefna
Stefnir 1:2	erumk leið fǫður reiði
Hfr V, 9:6	erumk leið sonar reiði
Jór 1:2	beið herr konungs reiði.

Only three lines come from encomiastic poetry, and two of those involve a "poetic boast" (Vst 1:2 *mérs fundr gefinn Þundar*) and a "bid for a hearing" (Vell 1:2 *heyr jarl Kvasis dreyra*). The lines from the *lausavísur* were clearly no more than empty padding with which the poets stuffed their stanzas to fulfill formal requirements. A2k Verbal-lines are relatively rare in eddic *fornyrðislag*, and usually contain single, one-line clauses, as in Vsp 50:2 *hefiz lind fyrir*, Vsp 59:6 *flýgr ǫrn yfir*, Vsp 66:6 *flýgr vǫll yfir*, Þrk 21:6 *brann iǫrð loga*, HHj 9:8 *verpr naðr hala*, Grp 17:8 *lifðu heill, konungr*, Grp 24:6 *lagt er alt fyrir*.

Type C Odd: (189 lines)   C: ×⫽̥⫽×⫽̥̄×⫽⫽×

Rdr 1:1	vilið Hrafnketill heyra
Vell 5:3	þýtr Óðrøris alda
VGl 1:5	verðr hróðrskotat harðla
Þmáhl 3:3	þar ák lífhvǫtuð leyfðan
Steinarr 2:5	nú hefr bjóðr forsa Bersa
Vell 7:5	ok rauðmána reynir
Vell 12:5	ok forsnjallir fellu
GSúrs 28:3	of rakskorinn reikar
Korm lv 45:3	sás / áttgrennir Unnar
Eg lv 29:3	við bifteini / bœnar.

Odd lines of Type C can be divided into two categories according to their clause function and the filler of position 1. If that position is occupied by a preposition (28 lines), the lines are sentence continuing (always line 3), and if it is occupied by a verb (25 lines), an introductory element (117 lines), or a pronoun plus verb (19 lines), the lines are sentence introductory.

In the twenty-eight continuing lines with a preposition in anacrusis, the words in positions 2-6 form a syntactic unit, either a nominal phrase (22 lines) or a verbal phrase (4 lines).[11] Only two lines have a sentence boundary after position 4, namely, Eg lv 29:3 *við bifteini / bœnar*, and Korm lv 52:3 *með blót roðin / beiði*. Both lines are unusual, and Egill's line belongs to a stanza that scholars regard as

spurious (*Skj* IA:56; see Poole 1991:177-81). Thirteen lines come from encomiastic poetry, and they usually contain an elaborate prepositional phrase that functions as a verbal constituent, as in the following examples:

Rdr 3:3	(knátti at vakna) með dreyrfáar dróttir
Rdr 13:7	(gingu) fyr vinjeyjar víðri ‖ vallrauf
Rdr 16:3	(lá) á Eynæfis ǫndri
Rdr 17:3	(starði) á haussprengi Hrungnis
Haustl 1:7	(sék) á hreingǫru hlýri
Vell 23:3	(þurðu framm) með svǫrgœli Sǫrva
Vell 26:3	(runnu) und sigrrunni svinnum
Vell 27:7	(bað varða) fyr Hlymnjǫrðum hurðar ‖ Hagbarða
Eil I, 1:3	(grœr) á sefreinu Sónar
Hfr III, 26:3	(vas œztr) und niðbyrði Norðra
Hfr III, 28:3	(varð ríkri) und niðbyrði Norðra.

Kuhn (1983:142-45) places a syntactic caesura before the cadence in these lines, but such a division is clearly not warranted by the syntactic structure.

The largest group of C-lines has a single introductory element in position 1 (117 lines). In ninety-three lines, positions 2-6 are occupied by a syntactic unit, and only twenty-four lines have no syntactic cohesion between position 4 and the cadence. Twelve of those twenty-four lines contain the sequence subject and direct or indirect object (instrumental), adverb, or vocative (Þmáhl 16:5 *nema Arnketill órum*, Eg lv 45:5 *es jarðgǫfugr orðum*, Vell 7:1 *ok oddneytir úti*, Korm lv 63:5 *þás slíðrdreginn Sága*), and four lines, all from encomiastic poetry, have the sequence direct object or indirect object (instrumental) and subject (Haustl 15:5 *þás hofregin hafrar*; see also Vell 35:1, Hfr III, 5:3, Hfr III, 18:5). Because of the placement of the subject, such lines cannot have posed any difficulties for the comprehension of the *helmingr*. The remaining lines without a syntactic unit in positions 2-6 are more complex. Four lines are from *lausavísur*. They all contain an encliticized subject, and in three out of four lines the compounds in positions 2-4 are part of the direct objects, that is, a sequence similar to S+constituent, above:[12]

Eg lv 21:5	áðr *Bergǫnund* benjum ‖ *bensœfðan létk venjask*
Korm lv 35:5	meðan *skerjarðar* Skarði ‖ *skorð man ek fyr norðan*
Korm lv 41:5	ok hyrketils hverja ‖ - ‖ - ‖ lák andvana banda
VGl 11:5	es *óvægins* eigi ‖ - ‖ - ‖ Gefnar *mák of hefna*.

Only two *helmingar* present a more convoluted word order. Both are from "Vellekla," and both have a suspended subject in line 4, in conjunction with the verb:

Vell 15:5-8   áðr veg jǫtna vitni
                      valfalls of sjá allan
                      (þeim stýra goð) / *geira*
                      garðs Hlórriði farði.

Vell 27:5   þás valserkjar virki
                      veðrhirði *bað* stirðan
                      fyr Hlymnjǫrðum hurðar
                      Hagbarða *gramr varða*.

It is clear, then, that in sentence-introductory lines with a connective in position 1, too, the regular filler of positions 2-6 was a syntactic unit. When the cadence is occupied by a word that does not form a unit with the compound in positions 2-6, the syntax is usually very simple, and the subject (or the direct object if the subject is encliticized) occurs either in positions 2-4 or in the cadence. None of the lines contains a sentence boundary before the cadence, but one has a sentence boundary after position 1: Korm lv 45:3 *sás / áttgrennir Unnar*. In this line, the nominal phrase in positions 2-6 concludes an earlier interrupted *kenning* (*áttgrennir Unnar søkkva*), and the connective in position 1 introduces a new clause (*sás orð sendi mér norðan*).

Nineteen lines are sentence introductory and have an adverb (*nú, þó, þá, svá, þar*) plus a verb in anacrusis.[13] Ten of those lines have a nominal or verbal syntactic unit in positions 2-6, and, of the nine lines without syntactic cohesion in positions 4-5, seven have the subject in positions 1 or 2-4 (Eg lv 18:1, Eg lv 24:5, Eyv lv 8:5, Steinarr 2:5, Styrr 1:7, Þjsk I, 1:5, Hfr V, 13:1), and the remaining two lines have the subject or part of the subject in initial position in the following even line (VGl 9:7, Hfr III, 24:5). There are no sentence boundaries, and neutralization in position 1 occurs in fourteen lines.

The syntax in sentence-introductory lines with an introductory element (single or in conjunction with a verb) is relatively uncomplicated. Eighty-one lines out of 136 have the subject in positions 2-4 or 2-6 (Rdr 10:5 *es þrymregin þremja*, Rdr 3:7 *þás hrafnbláir hefnðu*); sixteen lines have the subject in position 1, either as an encliticized subject or as a pronoun (VGl 8:5 *nú hefk Valþǫgnis vegna*, TE 4:7 *hverr ilþorna arnar*); ten lines have the subject in the cadence (Haustl 15:5 *þás hofregin hafrar*); and four lines have impersonal constructions (Korm lv 45:7 *þós Mengunnar manni*). If the subject is not contained in the C-line, it occurs in initial position in the following even line (11 lines: Eskál I, 1:5 *nús afrendra jǫfra // Ullr geirvaðils*) or as an encliticized subject in the following even line (5 lines, all *lausavísur*: Eg lv 21:5-6 *áðr Bergǫnund benjum // bensæfðan létk venjask*). Only nine *helmingar* have subjects that are postponed further than the following even line, and four of those were discussed above (Korm lv 41:5-8, VGl 11:5-8, Vell 15:5-8, Vell 27:5-8). In the remaining five *helmingar*, the suspended subjects occur

in lines 3 or 4, usually together with the verb, and those lines have no sentence boundaries:

Rdr 18:1	þás forns Litar flotna ‖ - ‖ *hrøkkviáll* of hrokkinn ‖ *hekk* Vǫlsunga drekku
Gldr 7:5	þás hugfylldra hǫlða ‖ - ‖ *hár vas sǫngr* of svírum
Hfr III, 20:5	alls sannliga segja ‖ - ‖ - ‖ hvárt tveggja mér *seggir*
Hfr V, 3:5	þvít álgrundar endis ‖ - ‖ betr *unnum* nú nytja
Hfr V, 25:5	ef glapskyldir gjalda ‖ - ‖ - ‖ matvísum *skalk* Grísi.

We see then, that, although C-lines with an introductory element in anacrusis can have a suspended verb, the placement of the subject in sentences introduced by C-lines follows the same patterns as earlier (Types E3, E4, B, A2k). The subjects or parts of the subjects occur as close to the beginning of the sentence as possible and are contained in the compounds themselves (positions 1-3 [E3], 1-2 [E4, A2k], or 2-4 [B, C]), enclitically to the inflected verb (*lausavísur*) or, more rarely, in the cadence or in initial position in the following even line.

The final group of sentence-introductory C-lines has finite verb in position 1 (25 lines). The verb is either monosyllabic (Þmáhl 6:7 *þaut andvaka unda*) or disyllabic bimoric with resolution (Þmáhl 15:1 *skalat ǫldrukkin ekkja*). Unlike in eddic *fornyrðislag* (e.g., Vsp 38:5 *fello eitrdropar*), no trimoric disyllabic verb can stand in anacrusis, so that in this respect *dróttkvætt* poetry was much more restrictive than *fornyrðislag*. As Kuhn pointed out, no trimoric monosyllabic verb can occur in position 1, if the compound in positions 2-6 contains a long-stemmed second element (Kuhn 1969b:408, 1983: 117, 145, 149). Hence there are lines like Hást 5:7 *þvarr hangrvǫlum Hanga*, Vst 1:1 *heyr Míms vinar mína*, Þmáhl 6:7 *þaut andvaka unda*, and Vell 5:3 *þýtr Óðrøris alda*, but no †*þvarr hangrgǫmmum Hanga*. That is exactly the opposite of what we find in Type E3, in which the verb can be long, and the second element in the compound in positions 1-3 must be long as well: Eg lv 28:7 *alfeigum skýtr ægir* (see Kuhn 1983:149). In two lines the internal rhyme falls on a verb in position 1 before the alliterating stave: VGl 1:5 *verðr hróðskotat harðla*, Eg lv 37:1 *nýtr illsǫgull ýtir*. Such lines are otherwise attested only from the eleventh century, when they enjoyed an increasing popularity (Kuhn 1969b:405-6, 408-10, 1983:146), and Kuhn, who regarded Egill's *lausavísa* 37 as spurious (Kuhn 1969b:408, 1983:262), suggested that they could have originated in the attempt to accommodate the rhyme and alliteration in the place name *Hringmaraheiðr* after the battle of *Ringmere* in East Anglia between the Vikings and the Anglo-Saxons around 1010 (Kuhn 1969b:416).

Syntactically, the C-lines introduced by a verb follow those lines that have a connective element in anacrusis. Eighteen lines have a syntactic unit in positions 2-6, and there are no sentence boundaries after position 4. One line, Eyv lv 13:5 *vita / ef akrmurur jǫkla*, has a sentence boundary after the verb in position 1, but the first

clause is impersonal (*vita*), and the second clause functions as the object of the first. The subjects occur in positions 2-4 or 2-6 (12 lines: Korm lv 46:1 *skulut níðingar neyða*, Þmáhl 15:1 *skalat ǫldrukkin ekkja*), in position 1 as an enclitic (3 lines: GSúrs 13:5 *sák blíðliga báðar*), in initial position in the following even line (1 line: Hást 5:7 *þvarr hangrvǫlum Hanga // hungr*), or the sentence is impersonal or in the imperative (9 lines: Vst 1:1 *heyr Míms vinar mína*).

We have seen that the structure of the compound in positions 2-4 must be $\overline{S}\,\breve{S}\,\breve{S}$ if a trimoric verb or a verb with internal rhyme occupied position 1. That principle does not apply to eddic *fornyrðislag*, in which the second element of the compound can be either long or short if a trimoric verb stands in anacrusis (e.g., HHj 11:7 *hyggz aldauðra*, Vsp 47:1 *scelfr Yggdrasils*). In *dróttkvætt* lines with other fillers than a trimoric verb in position 1, the shape of the compound is also irrelevant, and it can consist of a long syllable followed by a short ($\overline{S}\,\breve{S}\,\breve{S}$: 91 lines), by a long syllable followed by a long ($\overline{SS}\,\breve{S}$: 30 lines), or by a short syllable followed by a long ($\breve{S}\,\overline{S}\,\breve{S}$: 68 lines) (see the discussion by Kuhn 1983:143-45). The internal rhyme usually falls on the long syllable; in compounds with two long elements, it tends to fall on the second. It is not quite clear why the second element in the compound must be short if a trimoric verb stands in anacrusis. Kuhn suggested that it could be due to leveling; that is, if additional weight was added to the word in position 1, the element occupying positions 3-4 must be light (Kuhn 1969b:414-15). That explanation seems quite reasonable in view of the fact that, in Type A2k with two long syllables in positions 1-2, the disyllabic word in positions 3-4 is always bimoric.

Like odd Type D-lines, C-lines also contain inverted *kenningar* in which the word in the cadence modifies the first element of the compound in positions 2-4:

Rdr 10:5	es *þrym*regin *þremja*
Rdr 17:3	á *haus*sprengi *Hrungnis*
Eg lv 18:5	þvít *sár*laxa *Sýrar*
Korm lv 45:3	sás / *átt*grennir *Unnar*
GSúrs 9:5	þás *Log*sága *lœgis*
GSúrs 35:5	ok *Eld*njǫrun *ǫldu*
Þmáhl 4:1	skalk *þrym*viðum *þremja*
VGl 4:3	munat *eld*viðum *ǫldu*
VGl 4:5	áðr *grind*logi *Gǫndlar*
VGl 8:3	með *veðr*stǫfum *Viðris* (*vandar*)
Vell 27:7	fyr *Hlym*njǫrðum *hurðar*
Vell 30:5	ok *hald*boði *hildar*
Bbreiðv 4:5	ef *Eld*njǫrun *ǫldu*
Hfr III, 26:3, 28:3	und *nið*byrði *Norðra*
Hfr V, 11:3	fyr *Svip*njǫrðum *sverða*.

There can be no doubt that these inverted *kenningar* are the result of restrictions imposed by alliteration. If alliteration fell in positions 2 and 5, the following sequences of constituents are possible: (1) Q (Q + BW) + BW: Haustl 1:7 *á hreingǫru hlýri*; Rdr 18:1 *þás forns Litar flotna*; (2) BW (Q + BW) + Q: Eyv lv 4:5 *ef søkkspenni svinnan*, Eyv lv 9:5 *nús alfrǫðull elfar*; (3) Q^1 + BW + Q^2: Hfr III, 26:3, 28:3 *und niðbyrði Norðra*.

Odd Type C-lines are very common in eddic *fornyrðislag*, and the fillers of these lines are much less restricted than in *dróttkvætt*. Disyllabic trimoric words occur frequently in anacrusis (Vsp 27:3 *undir heiðvǫnom*, Vsp 46:1 *leica Míms synir*), and the anacrusis can also be occupied by two separate nonnominal words (Hym 38:5 *hver af hraunbúa*, HH I, 17:7 *enn með baugbrota*, HH I, 46:3 *þó dugir siclingom*, Grp 3:1 *þess mun glaðr konungr*). C-lines with resolution in position 2 are prohibited in *dróttkvætt* lines; in eddic lines resolution in that position is not common, and it can only occur if position 2 is filled by a single word (see Chap. 3, p. 61). As regards the clause function, however, eddic lines behave like skaldic *dróttkvætt*: if finite verbs or connectives occupy position 1, the lines are sentence introductory; if prepositions stand in anacrusis, they are sentence continuing.

Concluding Remarks

Alliteration in positions 1 and 5 in odd lines accounts for the different syntactic fillers in odd and even lines belonging to Types D1-2 and A2k (cf. the similar conditions in the previous group). These differences are reflected in the clause functions of odd and even A2k-lines: in odd lines, positions 3-4 must be occupied by a verb, and such lines were sentence introductory, whereas even lines with no restrictions on the filler of positions 3-4 were either sentence continuing or concluding.

The restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd D1-2- and C-lines prompted the creation of a special type of *kenningar* in which the alliterating nomen in the cadence modified or was being modified by the first element of the compound in positions 1-4 or 2-4 (inverted *kenningar*). In odd lines of Types D1-2, the alliterating word in position 1 must modify the nominal phrase in positions 2-4. Because bisemantic compounds must alliterate in odd lines, positions 2-4 in D1-2-lines were always occupied by monosemantic units and compounds (*hug-reynandi*, *blakk-ríðandi*, *Bergóneris*, *naglfara*). That explains the scarcity of odd D2-lines, as well as the absence of odd lines of Types E1-2, in which the enclitic ending in position 3 (*ilja-blað*) severely limited the number of possible monosemantic fillers (e.g., all *nomina agentis* of the type *ríðandi* and *reynandi* were excluded). In even lines with only one alliterating stave, such restrictions do not appear to have been in effect.

The wealth of compounds in groups I and II was an important component of the poetic diction, and these bipartite compounds provided the skalds with the necessary tools to accommodate rhyme and alliteration, especially in even lines. Most of these compounds are parts of *kenningar*, and it can be no coincidence that most of the even lines, which were either sentence continuing or concluding, favored fillers of Types E3-4, D2, and A2k. It also appears that the skalds often employed even lines of a certain type more than once in a stanza, which could mean that they consciously or unconsciously attempted to achieve a uniform rhythmic effect in even lines. No such tendency is evident in odd lines, in which certain types of fillers were favored by some poets, but not within the same stanza.

Because of the syllabic restrictions on positions 3-4 in even A2k-lines, the nominal fillers of those positions could be quite stereotyped. Certain high-frequency bimoric nomina like *faðir*, *konungr*, and the name *Haraldr* could only be accommodated in those positions (or in initial position with resolution), and the praise poems to the Norwegian kings Haraldr hárfagri and Haraldr gráfeldr, for example, all contain even A2k-lines with tripartite structures and the name *Haraldr* in positions 3-4. Type A2k Verbal, which mainly consists of parenthetic clauses of insignificant content, is characterized by verbal repetition that revolves around the filler of positions 3-4 (*bani, sonar, faðir*).

In odd lines, sentence boundaries are in general avoided, especially if the lines are sentence introductory (A2k, C). In most lines the words in positions 2-6 and 3-6 form a syntactic unit, and Kuhn's contention that all such lines contain a syntactic caesura before the cadence is not borne out by their syntactic structure. In even lines, the majority of sentence boundaries occur after positions 1 (D2) and 2 (A2k), and there is strong syntactic coherence between the words in positions 2-6 and 3-6. Such even lines Kuhn classified as "new" types of D/A2k, in which the syntactic organization had obliterated the old caesura after position 4 and created a new arrangement with syntactic units in positions 2/3-6 (Kuhn 1983:172-75). Hence he assigned lines like Haustl 6:6 *dolg ballastan vallar* and Rdr 6:8 *Jónakrs sonum launa* (in Kuhn's notation, *dolg ballastan / vallar* and *Jónakrs sonum / launa*) to his Types D and A2k respectively, whereas Haustl 3:6 *már valkastar báru* and Rdr 17:4 *harðgeðr neðan starði* (*már / valkastar báru* and *harðgeðr / neðan starði*), according to him, belong to the new types of syntactic fillers (Kuhn 1983:165-66, 173, 175). It is not quite clear why the syntactic structures S+SSSS and SS+SSSS should be more recent than the structure SSSS+SS (incidentally, none of the above lines seems to contain syntactic breaks at all). Lines with sentence breaks after positions 1 and 2 are attested in the earliest *dróttkvætt* ("Ragnarsdrápa"), and there is no evidence that there ever existed a "pre-Bragi stage" in which Kuhn's syntactic structures were universal. Kuhn's distribution of syntactic caesuras in even A2k-lines is clearly based on his distribution of such caesuras in odd lines (after position 4). As we have seen, however, odd A2k-lines usually have a syntactic unit in positions 3-6, and their structure is certainly

SS+SSSS rather than SSSS+SS (e.g., Eil III, 1:1 *setbergs kveða sitja*). We must conclude, then, that in even lines of Types D2 and A2k, sentence boundaries could occur after position 4 as well as after positions 1 and 2; that the latter was much more common; and that no chronological development can be detected with regard to the different syntactic organizations of such lines. When positions 3-6 or 2-6 do not form a syntactic unit, the lines are either sentence final, or the words in the cadence complete an earlier disrupted phrase, creating a release of syntactic tension and providing something like a framing effect.

The placement of the subject in sentence-introductory lines corroborates the results obtained in the discussion in the previous chapter, and it is clear that, as far as the placement of the subject (and the verb) goes, the word order of *dróttkvætt* stanzas was not at all haphazard, but highly predictable, and not very different from that of prose.

All the types of *dróttkvætt* lines discussed in this chapter occur in eddic *fornyrðislag* as well, and we can note the following main differences between the two poetic genres: first of all, in odd *fornyrðislag* lines there was no fifth syllable carrying alliteration, such odd A2k- and D-lines approximated even *dróttkvætt* lines both in terms of syntactic fillers and clause function, and odd lines of Type D2 were not avoided (but there was frequent alliteration in positions 1 and 2). Second, the fillers of Type C *fornyrðislag* lines were far less restricted that those of *dróttkvætt*, especially with regard to the word(s) occupying position 1. In other cases, however, *dróttkvætt* and *fornyrðislag* had identical fillers in positions 1-4, but the syntactic arrangement in *dróttkvætt* lines differed on account of the additional word in the cadence, which tended to form a syntactical unit with the preceding part of the line (e.g., Hym 31:6 *hiálmstofn ofan* vs. GSúrs 34:8 *hjalmstofn ofan klofna*).

Type A

Type A1¹ Odd: (86 lines)   A1¹: $\underset{o}{/}\!/\!\times/\!/\!\times$o$\times$

Rdr 5:7	hǫrðum herðimýlum
Korm lv 3:3	Hristar hǫrviglæstrar
Glúmr I, 2:7	sendi seggja kindar
Eyv lv14:1	fengum feldarstinga
Korm lv 42:1	heitask hellur fljóta
Jór 2:3	sýnisk svartleitr reyni
Styrr 1:5	uggik eigi seggja
Þmáhl 8:5	hvatkis Hildar gǫtva
Vell 26:7	Dofra danskra jǫfra
Hfr V, 2:3	ótti / eingadóttur.

In Type A1¹, the alliterating staves fall in positions 1 and 3 and the internal rhymes in positions 1 and 5. The lines consist of the syllabic sequence SS+SS+SS, and positions 2, 4, and 6 are occupied by enclitic inflectional endings. Long nominal syllables ("heavy dips") can occur in position 3, for example, Jór 2:3 *sýnisk svartleitr reyni* (see also Eg lv 30:1, Eyv lv 10:3, 10:7, Þjsk IV, 5:1).[1]

Depending on the filler of positions 1-2, odd A1¹-lines are either sentence introductory or sentence continuing. If a finite verb occupies positions 1-2 (52 lines), the line is sentence introductory, and if a nomen or an adverb occupies those positions, the line is sentence continuing. One line has an indefinite pronoun in positions 1-2, and that line is also sentence introductory (Þmáhl 8:5 *hvatkis Hildar gǫtva*).

The words in positions 3-6 usually form a syntactic unit: twenty-one lines have a compound in those positions (e.g., Hást 5:1 *unnum auðimǫnnum*), and fifty-four lines have a nominal phrase, in which the order of elements is Q+BW (e.g., GSúrs 31:7 *missti menja lestir*).[2] There is also strong syntactic cohesion between the words in positions 1-2 and 3-6. Seventeen lines have a nominal phrase in positions 1-6, and the nomen in positions 1-2 either modifies or is being modified by the words in positions 3-6, as the following examples show:

Rdr 5:7	hǫrðum herðimýlum
Þmáhl 17:3	fúra fleygiáru
Eg lv 39:3	hlífa hneitiknífum
Rdr 15:3	œgir ǫflugbarða
Hfr I, 6:3	stefnir stǫðvar hrafna
Gráf 9:3	gætir Glamma sóta.

Forty-three lines contain the sequence v+NP (e.g., Hfr II, 8:5 *eyddi ulfa greddir*). Because alliteration falls in positions 1 and 3, there are no restrictions on the semantic properties of the words in positions 3-6; that is, they can be monosemantic (GSúrs 9:3 *gætin Gjúkadóttur*) or bisemantic (Vell 8:3 *sverða sverrifjarðar*).

Fifteen lines out of eighty-six have no syntactic connection between positions 1-2 and 3-6, and the following three lines contain sentence boundaries after position 2: Skall 2:7 *heitu / hrœrikytjur*, Eg lv 18:3 *víti / várrar sveitar*, Hfr V, 2:3 *ótti / eingadóttur*. All these lines have a syntactic unit in positions 3-4, and that is also the case with the other lines in which positions 1-2 and 3-4 do not form a unit. The following examples demonstrate the point (see also GSúrs 33:3, Styrr 1:3, Vell 26:7, Hfr I, 4:3, I, 7:3):

Rdr 9:3	malma mætum hilmi
Eg lv 24:3	ǫldu enskrar foldar
Sindr 5:3	Ónars eiki grónu
Sindr 7:7	undan allar kindir
Eyv lv 8:3	fjǫllum Fýrisvalla
Vst 2:3	grœnnar grǫfnum munni
GSúrs 9:3	gætin Gjúkadóttur.

Conversely, six lines have no syntactic unit in positions 3-6, and one has a sentence boundary before the cadence (Korm lv 1:3 *réttumk risti / snótar*). In all these lines, positions 1-2 are occupied by a finite verb:[3]

Jór 2:3	sýnisk svartleitr reyni
Eyv lv 10:7	fyllik flokk þinn stillir
Styrr 1:5	uggik eigi seggja
Þjsk IV, 5:1	hrollir hugr minn illa
Eyv lv 10:3	bellir bragningr elli.

Four of these lines have a long nomen in position 4, and, with the exception of Eyv lv 10:3, in which positions 3-4 are occupied by a vocative, the words in positions 1-4 form a syntactic unit (v+S, v+Adv.).

We see then that, although the syntactic organization of Type A1[1] could follow the patterns SS+SSSS and SSSS+SS (with a finite verb in positions 1-2), most lines have no syntactic breaks. Furthermore, if the line is sentence introductory, sentence boundaries after position 2 (after the verb) are avoided: in such instances, the syntactic arrangement can be SSSS+SS, rather than SS+SSSS (*réttumk risti / snótar*), but the most common sequence in sentence-introductory lines is clearly v+ NP (positions 1-6).

In sentence-introductory lines, it is customary for the subject or parts of the subject to follow the verb (17 lines). Ten lines contain no subject, and the subject occurs in the following even line (e.g., Rdr 19:1 *vildit vrǫngum ofra // vágs hyrsendir*; 7 lines), in an earlier line (e.g., Korm lv 35:3 *landvǫrðr // várat virðar stœri*; 3 lines), or in line 3 (Hfr II, 1:5 *hlóðu Hamðis klæðum // - // hilmis menn*: 1 line). Twenty-four lines have either impersonal verb constructions or suppressed or encliticized subjects. All the latter lines are from *lausavísur*, and the skald or the skald and his companions are the subjects of the action described in the *helmingar*. Consider the following examples:

Eg lv 42:1	áttkak erfinytja
Eyv lv 11:1	skyldak skerja foldar
Eyv lv 13:1	látum langra nóta
Korm lv 40:1	hvílum handar bála
Hást 5:1	unnum auðimǫnnum.

In this respect, there is a great difference between the sentence structure of *lausavísur* and encomiastic poems. In the subject-oriented *lausavísur*, the subject can be contained in the verb (cf. E3 Odd), and in such cases the words in positions 3-6 usually function as the object (direct or indirect, as in Hfr V, 15:7 *leyfik ljóssa vífa // [lund]*, Hást 5:1 *unnum auðimǫnnum*) or as a vocative (Korm lv 40:1 *hvílum handar bála // Hlín*, Eyv lv 11:1 *skyldak skerja foldar // skíðrennandi*). In lines from encomiastic poetry, however, the words in positions 3-6 often designate the subject of the eulogy, as in the following lines:

Rdr 10:1	letrat *lýða stillir* (Hǫgni)
Gráf 7:1	mælti *mœtra hjalta* ‖ *Malmóðinn sá* (Haraldr)
Gráf 9:7	olli *jǫfra spjalli* (Haraldr)
Hr II, 8:5	eyddi *ulfa greddir* (Óláfr).

Twenty-nine lines belong to panegyrics, and they occur with high frequency in "Ragnarsdrápa" (5 lines), "Gráfeldardrápa" (5 lines), and Hallfreðr's "Hákonardrápa" (4 lines). In most cases, Type A1[1] introduces longer sentences that are continued in subsequent lines, but Egill appears to have favored short sentences

that occupy one line or one line and positions 1-2 in the next line, as the following examples show:

Eg lv 30:1	hǫggum hjaltvǫnd skyggðan
Eg lv 30:3	reynum randar mána
Eg lv 30:7	kyrrum kappa errinn
Eg lv 31:3	hræðisk hodda beiðir ‖ happlauss /
Eg lv 19:7	leiðisk lofða stríði ‖ landáss /
Eg lv 20:3	blekkir brœðra søkkva ‖ brúðfang /.

Odd lines of Type A1¹ were quite common in *fornyrðislag*, and they have the same types of syntactic fillers as *dróttkvætt* (v+n, n+n): Vsp 41:1 *fylliz fiǫrvi*, Sg 40:1 *unnac einom*, Hym 14:3 *gýgiar grœti*, HH I, 12:7 *grára geira*. Sometimes a long nominal syllable can occupy position 4, as in HHj 1:1 *sáttu Sigrlinn*, Sg 4:4 *mæki málfán*. However, *fornyrðislag* was much less restrictive than *dróttkvætt* about the filler of position 2: eddic lines frequently contain neutralizations of the type Vsp 17:3 *ǫflgir oc ástgir*, which were banned from *dróttkvætt* lines (see Kuhn 1983:70).

Type A2¹ Odd: (3 lines)   A2¹: ‖×̄×̄×‖×

Skall 3:7	þorfgi væri þeirar
VGl 4:1	eigi sofnak Ófnir
Hfr III, 10:1	eigi látask ýtar.

Type A2¹ has the same syllabic structure as A1¹, but the alliterating staves fall in positions 1 and 5, that is, the same placement of alliteration as in groups I and II. Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, a nominal filler in positions 3-4 would technically only be possible if the line consisted of a nominal phrase in which the words in positions 1-4 modified or were being modified by the word in the cadence (†*herðimýlum hǫrðum*). No such lines exist, however, and we must conclude that in A2¹, as in A1¹, the syntactic arrangement called for a syntactic unit in positions 3-6 (SS+SSSS). In that case, positions 3-4 could not be occupied by a nomen, because this would involve the prohibited sequence n+ń. That explains the verbal fillers of positions 3-4 in the lines above, and also why the type was avoided.

All three lines contain a negation (*-gi, eigi*), and Kuhn, who did not comment on the verbal filler of positions 3-4, speculated that rhetorical emphasis could have contributed to the creation of these lines (Kuhn 1983:139). However, their syntactic structure is very close to that of such odd E3- and XE3-lines as Korm lv 50:5 *rýðk eigi ek rauða* and Hfr V, 14:5 *stendr eigi sá sendir*, in which the verb in

position 1 must be followed by an adverb, and it is difficult not to assume a connection.

None of the lines contains sentence boundaries, and they are all sentence introductory with the subject in position 1 (*þǫrf-*), enclitically in position 4 (*sofnak*), or in the cadence (*ýtar*), following the finite verb in positions 3-4. In eddic poetry the type occurs frequently, but, because the word in positions 3-4 is not followed by an alliterating word (the cadence), *fornyrðislag* allows a great variety of syntactic fillers, such as n+v (Vsp 7:5 *afla lǫgðo*), n+n (Vsp 31:3 *Óðins barni*, Hlr 5:7 *ástalausa*), Adv+v (Hym 20:7 *litla fýsi*). None of the lines has the adverb *eigi* in positions 1-2 (but cf. Od 1:5 *engi mátti*, Grp 40:5 *vilda ec eigi*). In *fornyrðislag*, the restrictions imposed by alliteration in odd lines of Type A2¹ no longer apply, and, as in even *dróttkvætt* lines, the sequence ń+n is not prohibited (Vsp 24:1-2 *fleygði Óðinn // oc í fólc um scaut*, 46:7-8 *mælir Óðinn // við Míms hǫfuð*, 47:5 *hræðaz allir // á helvegom*; see Heusler 1956:112).

Type A3¹ Odd: (24 lines)   A3¹: ͞×× // × // ×

Haustl 10:5	gerðusk allar áttir
Gldr 4:7	endisk rauðra randa
GSúrs 28:1	hugðak Geymigǫndul
Hfr III, 12:3	óðusk malmþings meiðar
Ormr 1:1	hvégis Draupnis drógar
Eg lv 7:5	gerðum reiðir róstu
HolmgB 4:7	uggik hvergi at hyggja.

In Type A3¹ Odd, positions 3 and 5 alliterate and, whereas positions 3-6 can be occupied by a nominal phrase (19 lines), the word in positions 1-2 must be verbal (22 lines) or adverbial (2 lines). The type is always sentence introductory and contains no sentence boundaries.

The following five lines do not have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6:

Hildr 1:1	hafnið Nefju nafna
Eg lv 7:5	gerðum reiðir róstu
HolmgB 4:7	uggik hvergi at hyggja
GSúrs 30:1	máttut skildi skaldi
Þjsk IV, 4:5	eigum bernskligt báðir.

All lines are from *lausavísur*, and two lines (Hildr 1:1, Eg lv 7:5) contain an independent one-line clause. According to Kuhn (1983:92, 156), our A3¹-lines have a syntactic caesura after position 4. However, nineteen out of twenty-four lines have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6, and it is difficult to understand why a

line like GSúrs 34:1 *hugðak hlífar flagða // (hristendr)* (in Kuhn's notation, GSúrs 34:1 *hugðak / hlífar flagða*) should be treated differently from GSúrs 28:1 *hugðak Geymigǫndul* (in Kuhn's notation, GSúrs 28:1 *hugðak Geymi-/ gǫndul*). Based on the syntactic arrangement in odd A1-2-lines, we must conclude that all three types prefer a syntactic unit in positions 3-6 (SS+SSSS); that they are sentence introductory (except A1-lines without a verb in positions 1-2); and that sentence boundaries are avoided.

The placement of the subject in odd A3[1]-lines follows that of Type A1[1]. Eight lines have the order v+S, eighteen lines have impersonal verb constructions or encliticized or suppressed subjects, and the only suspended subject occurs in the following even line (Korm lv 54:1). All but one of the lines with encliticized or suppressed subjects are from *lausavísur*, and the difference between the structure of *lausavísur* and encomiastic poems in that respect is again quite striking. Three out of the six encomiastic lines belong to the ninth century ("Haustlǫng" and "Glymdrápa"), and Egill's poetry contains the highest number of lines from *lausavísur*.

Odd *fornyrðislag* lines of Type A3[1] usually also contain a finite verb in positions 1-2, and they are sentence introductory (e.g., Vsp 7:1 *hittuz æsir*, Þrk 30:5 *leggit Miǫllni*, HH I, 23:5 *spurði Helgi*, HH II, 6:3 *eigom heima*, Sg 38:1 *létom síga*). In some cases, an adverb may occupy those positions, as in HHj 3:5 *eigi brúðir*, Gðr I, 2:5, 5:1, 11:1 *þeygi Guðrún*, but such lines are the exception rather than the rule.

Type A1 Even: (40 lines)   A1: $\llap{/}/\times\bar{\underline{x}}\times$o$\times$

Gráf 10:2	heggir mækis eggja
Hfr III, 3:4	gengis þrœnzkra drengja
Eg lv 1:6	stýra dýrum knerri
Rdr 20:2	vinda ǫndurdísar
Hfr III, 13:8	lengi slíkra drengja
Korm lv 3:6	síðan gollmens Fríðar
Gráf 13:2	tíðum / Hallinskíða.

All even lines of Type A1 are sentence continuing (9 lines) or concluding (30 lines), except Eg lv 1:6 (*stýra dýrum knerri*). Because even lines were not subject to the same restrictions of alliteration as odd lines, the filler of positions 1-2 can be nominal (28 lines: Eg lv 12:4 *heiðis vingameiði*), adverbial (4 lines: Hfr V, 14:6 *síðan Hlakkar skíða*), or infinitival/participial (6 lines: Korm lv 17:8 *unna sǫlva Gunni*, Hfr V, 26:4 *aflat báru skafli*). Only two lines contain a finite verb in initial position. Thirty-nine lines have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6, twelve of which are compounds, and the order of elements is usually Q+BW (except in Hfr V, 21:8

sínum / ábyrgð mína). Eight lines contain a nominal phrase in positions 1-6, but no lines have the theoretically possible sequence †*herðimýlum verða* (see Kuhn 1983:163). We must conclude, then, that the syntactic arrangement of even lines, like that of odd A¹-lines, was SS+SSSS rather than SSSS+SS.

Thirteen lines have a sentence boundary after position 2, and in ten of those lines the words in positions 3-5 complete a nominal phrase or a verbal phrase from line 1, thus creating a framing effect such as we observed earlier in Types D2 and A2k. The following examples illustrate that point:[4]

Eg lv 17:4	hótun / **Þyrnifótar** (erfingi)
Gráf 2:8	seggi / **mækis eggjar** (rauð)
Korm lv 47:8	ásar / **tveggja gása** (af blóði)
GSúrs 17:4	sauma / **mínir draumar** (villa oss)
Þmáhl 1:4	nýjum / **kvinna frýju** (varðak mik).

The internal rhymes always fall in positions 1 and 5, except in Bragi's Rdr 20:2 *vinda ǫndurdísar*. As we have seen earlier (Chap. 1, p. 6), that particular placement of internal rhymes (positions 1 and 3) was favored by Bragi, and Snorri lists it among the features that characterize his *Bragaháttr* ('Bragi's meter,' Ht. 58; *SnE* I:672).

Even lines of Type A¹ were not at all common and, except for fourteen lines from Hallfreðr's poetry, most lines belong to the ninth or early tenth century (Rdr 4, Eg 4, Gráf 4, Korm 8). Without a statistical examination of even lines from later centuries, it is impossible to say whether even A¹-lines became increasingly unpopular, but the fact that Snorri uses such lines to create a separate variant of *dróttkvætt*, namely *draugsháttr* ('ghost meter' [?], Ht 30; *SnE* I:640), could indicate that, at least by the thirteenth century, even A¹-lines had become so rare as to warrant a separate treatment:[5]

In eddic *fornyrðislag*, even lines of Type A¹ were very common, and the filler can be nominal (Vsp 1:2 *helgar kindir*, Vsp 39:6 *eyrarúno*, Vsp 46:4 *Giallarhorni*), verbal (Vsp 2:4 *fœdda hǫfðo*), or consist of the sequences n+v (Vsp 8:2 *teitir vóro*, Vsp 59:8 *fisca veiðir*), v+n (Hym 10:6 *glumðo iǫclar*), or (Adv.+v (Hym 20:4 *útarr fœra*). As in odd A¹-lines, the restrictions on neutralization in position 2 were much more lax in *fornyrðislag* than in *dróttkvætt*, and lines like Vsp 6:10 *árom at telia*, Vsp 17:4 *æsir, at húsi* occur frequently.

Type A1² Odd: (222 lines)   *A1²:* $\underset{0}{/}/$x$/$/xo×

Rdr 7:3	Ræs gǫfumk reiðar mána
Haustl 5:1	fljótt bað foldar dróttinn
Gldr 7:1	ríks / þreifsk reiddra ǫxa

Gráf 12:1	þar vas / þrafna byrjar
Rdr 8:7	bar til byrjar drǫsla
Eg lv 11:7	helt / né hrafnar sultu
Hfr V, 5:1	veitk / at vísu skreyti
Gldr 8:5	áðr fyr eljunprúðum
Gráf 5:3	brand / þars bjarmskar kindir
Haustl 12:7	ern at ǫglis barni.

In Type A1² Odd, position 4 is occupied by an enclitic inflectional ending, and a finite verb (106 lines), a preposition (88 lines), a connective (24 lines), an adverb (3 lines), or the definite article (1 line) occupies position 2. The alliterating staves fall in positions 1 and 3, and the internal rhymes in positions 1 and 5.

Lines with a finite verb in position 2 are sentence introductory, and in ninety-five lines that verb is followed by a nominal phrase. In some cases the words in positions 1 and 3-6 form a syntactic unit, as in the following lines:[6]

Rdr 7:3, 12:3	*Ræs* gǫfumk *reiðar mána*
Rdr 16:1	*vaðr* lá *Viðris arfa*
Hgóði 1:3	*hríð* vex *Hamðis klæða*
Eyv lv 9:7	*ráð* eru *ramrar þjóðar*
Korm lv 4:3	*bands* mank *Beiðarindi*.

Because positions 1 and 3 alliterate, the sequence of elements in those interrupted phrases is ń+ń+n, and no restrictions apply.

If a finite verb occupies position 2, a sentence boundary could fall after position 1 (2 lines), or after positions 2 (3 lines) or 4 (1 line):

Gldr 7:1	ríks / þreifsk reiddra øxa
Korm lv 59:7	lunds / komk lítlu sprundi
Gráf 12:1	þar vas / þrafna byrjar
HólmgB 4:5	gamall emk / geira vimrar
Þmáhl 13:7	lind beit / lǫgðis kindir
Þmáhl 6:3	hrafn naut hræva / Gefnar.

Whereas the latter four lines conform to our earlier observations about the placement of sentence boundaries in sentence-introductory lines (no sentence boundaries could occur before the finite verb), the first two lines apparently violate that principle.[7] In Kormákr's line, however, the word in position 1 does not begin a new sentence, rather, it is the suspended base word in a *kenning* from lines 1-2, and the verb in position 2 introduces a new clause (*komk lítlu sprundi || ór ǫngum*).[8] The line from "Glymdrápa" is sentence introductory and the attributive genitive in position 1 modifies a nomen in line 4 (Gldr 7:5-8 *ríks þjóðkonungs*). In our

excerpted *dróttkvætt* corpus, this is the only line in which a sentence boundary occurs before the introduction of the finite verb in an independent clause.

The distribution of subjects in odd A1²-lines with a finite verb in position 2 is highly traditional. In forty lines the subject occurs in initial position before the verb; in twenty-seven lines it occurs directly after the verb; twenty-one lines have suppressed or encliticized subjects (seventeen lines are from *lausavísur*); four lines contain impersonal constructions; and in ten instances the subject occurs in the following odd line. Three *helmingar* with sentence-introductory A1²-lines have suspended subjects, and all these half-stanzas belong to panegyrics:

Haustl 9:1	sér bað sagna hrœri ‖ - ‖ - ‖ áttrunnr Hymis /
Gráf 12:1	þar vas / þrafna byrjar ‖ - ‖ sjálfr
Hfr III, 24:1	enn segir auðar kenni ‖ - ‖ seggr.

Thirty-eight odd A1²-lines have a finite verb in position 1. These lines are either sentence introductory (34 lines) or sentence continuing (4 lines). In twenty-eight of these thirty-eight lines the verb is followed by a prepositional phrase (positions 2-6), as in the following lines:

Rdr 8:7	bar til byrjar drǫsla
Haustl 6:3	át af eikirótum
Eyv lv 1:7	fáum til fornra vápna
Gráf 6:1	braut við brynju njóta
GSúrs 31:5	sneið at sínu ráði.

Nine lines have sentence boundaries after the verb in position 1, and in eight of those lines a new clause is introduced by an introductory element in position 2 (e.g., Eg lv 11:7 *helt / né hrafnar sultu*, Hfr V, 5:1 *veitk / at vísu skreyti*).

The fact that most of the sentence-introductory A1²-lines with finite verbs in position 1 have a prepositional phrase or the elements of another clause in positions 3-6 has consequences for the placement of the subject. Unless the verb was part of an impersonal construction (2 lines), the subject could occur enclitically to the verb or be suppressed (9 lines), or it must be postponed to a later line. Fifteen of out twenty-one suspended subjects occur in the following even line:

Haustl 8:1	fló með fróðgum tívi ‖ fangsæll
Haustl 14:5	ók at ísarnleiki ‖ Jarðar sunr
Eg lv 22:7	stendr af styrjar skyndi ‖ starf
Eyv lv 3:1	lýtr fyr lǫngum spjótum ‖ lands folk
GSúrs 31:5	sneið at sínu ráði ‖ sverðs egg.

Only six subjects are suspended to a later line, and all but one subject occur in line 4:

Steinunn 2:1	braut fyr bjǫllu gæti ‖ - ‖ mǫgfellandi Mellu
Gráf 6:1	braut við brynju njóta ‖ - ‖ - ‖ Nóregs konungr
Korm lv 14:1	hneit við Hrungnis fóta ‖ - ‖ - ‖ engisax
Vell 20:1	hóf und hyrjar kneyfi ‖ - ‖ - ‖ vandar dýr
Hfr III, 27:1	illts / þats ulfa sultar ‖ - ‖ - ‖ mein
Hfr V, 15:1	leggr at lýsibrekku ‖ - ‖ - ‖ heitr ofremðar sveiti.

There can be no doubt then, that the skalds attempt to place the subject as close to the verb as possible and that, if the subject does not or cannot occur in the odd line, its regular place is the initial position in the following even line. If positions 2-6 are not occupied by a prepositional phrase or the elements of a new clause, the subject occupies those positions (e.g., Þjsk IV, 6:1 *hvarf enn hildardjarfi*).

Another eleven lines of Type A1^2 are also sentence introductory, but they introduce bound clauses (introductory element in position 1) and contain no verbs. In these lines, too, positions 2-6 are frequently occupied by a prepositional phrase (7 out of 11 lines), and the most common place for the suspended subject is again the initial position of the following even line (5 lines; e.g., Gldr 8:5 *áðr fyr eljunprúðum // allr herr Skota*). This means that, although most bound clauses have no finite verb in the sentence-introductory line, it was nevertheless very important that the subject occur as close to the beginning of the sentence as possible (cf. the similar conditions in Types B and C). Whereas the introductory element would signal the beginning of a new sentence, the introduction of the subject (and the verb) must have clarified the syntactic arrangement and facilitated the comprehension of the stanzas during recitation.

The remaining sixty-four odd lines of Type A1^2 are sentence concluding or continuing. In these lines, position 1 is occupied by a nomen, adverb, or pronoun, and a connective or a preposition occurs in position 2 (15 and 49 lines, respectively).[9] The former lines always have a sentence boundary after position 1 (e.g., Hást 7:7 *sylg / es Sleituhelgi*); in the latter lines, positions 2-6 are always occupied by a prepositional phrase (e.g., Eg lv 8:7 *austr af unnar hesti*), and three lines have a sentence boundary after position 1 (Eg lv 35:3 *þung / til þessar gǫngu*, Vell 7:3 *glaðr / í Gǫndlar veðrum*, Hfr V, 25:7 *mǫrk / fyr minstan verka*). If the word in position 1 is a noun, it can modify the nominal phrase in positions 3-6 (e.g., Hfr V, 23:3 *mans at malma sennu*, GSúrs 16:3 *morðs við Mætinjǫrðu*).

To sum up: odd lines of Type A1^2 with a verb in position 2 or a verb or an introductory element in position 1 are sentence introductory. In such lines, sentence boundaries are rare and usually fall after the finite verb (positions 1, 2, and 4). If the filler of the first position is nonverbal/nonintroductory and position 2 contains a preposition, adverb, or connective, the lines are either sentence continuing or concluding, and sentence boundaries occur after position 1. If there are no sentence

boundaries, syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2 is possible (19 lines), and, if there is a sentence boundary after position 2, there is no such cohesion.[10] Neutralization occurs in position 2, but only if that position is occupied by a verb (e.g., Rdr 7:3 *Ræs gǫfumk reiðar mána*), and, likewise, resolution is possible in position 1, but it usually only involves bimoric disyllabic verbal forms (e.g., HolmgB 1:5 *skora mun Skǫglar dýra*, Eyv lv 1:7 *fáum til fornra vápna*). Most odd A1²-lines have nominal phrases in positions 3-6 (183 lines, i.e., 82 percent), and the syntactic arrangement is clearly S+S+SSSS.

Type A1² Odd is common in eddic *fornyrðislag*, and we find the same types of fillers of positions 1-4 as in *dróttkvætt*, namely, sentence-introductory (Vsp 2:1 *ec man iǫtna*, Vsp 28:7 *alt veit ec, Óðinn*, Vsp 52:3 *scínn af sverði*, Hym 12:1 *séðu, hvar sitia*, Od 28:7 *enn í ormgarð*) and sentence-continuing lines (Hym 15:7 *einn með ǫllo*, Vsp 59:3 *iǫrð ór ægi*, HH I, 55:7 *iǫfur, þann er olli*). *Fornyrðislag* is, however, far less restrictive about the syllabic filler of position 2 than *dróttkvætt* (e.g., Hym 14:5 *þar vóro þiórar*, HH I, 5:1 *eitt var at angri*, HH I, 49:1 *snúaz hér at sandi*), and that accounts for the main difference between the fillers of eddic and skaldic lines.

Type A3² Odd: (82 lines)   A3²: $\bar{x}×\!/\!/×\!/\!/×$

Rdr 6:1	mjǫk lét stála støkkvir
Eyv lv 6:7	nú tregr Gætigauta
Korm lv 33:7	nú hefk illan enda
Bragi II, 3:3	þat gaf / Fjǫlnis fjalla
HolmgB 13:7	rauðk á brynju beiði
Vígf II, 1:3	þryngr at Viðris veðri
Eg lv 10:1	gekk / sás óðisk ekki
Haustl 5:5	en af breiðu bjóði
Rdr 13:3	svát af rennirauknum
Rdr 5:1	þar / svát gerðu gyrðan.

Owing to restrictions imposed by alliteration, there are no odd lines of Type A2²: in A2-lines the words in positions 3-4 form a syntactic unit, usually nominal, and such constructions were precluded by the sequence n+ń (see above, Type A2¹). In Type A3², positions 3 and 5 alliterated, and there were no such restrictions (ń+ń). Lines of this type were sentence introductory, either introducing an independent clause with the finite verb in positions 1 (23 lines) or 2 (48 lines), or introducing a bound clause with a connective in position 1 (11 lines).

Only five lines contain sentence boundaries, either after position 2 (if the verb occupies that position; Bragi II, 3:3 *þat gaf / Fjǫlnis fjalla*) or after position 1 (after a verb or a connective in position 1), so in that respect Type A3² resembles

sentence-introductory A1²-lines. The syntactic arrangements in A3² are also similar to those of sentence-introductory A1²-lines. If position 2 is occupied by the verb, the subject occurs in position 1 (15 lines; e.g., Korm lv 18:3 *þeir hafa lǫgðis loddu*), in positions 3-6 (8 lines; e.g., Rdr 6:1 *mjǫk lét stála støkkvir*), in the following line (6 lines; e.g., Eyv lv 6:7 *nú tregr Gǽtigauta // grams fall*), or it is suppressed or encliticized (19 lines; e.g., GSúrs 15:5 *fátt kveða fleyja brautar*, Korm lv 56:7 *betr annk Sigliságu*). If position 1 contains the finite verb and positions 3-6 are occupied by a prepositional phrase or the elements belonging to another clause, the subject is suppressed or encliticized (9 lines; e.g., Hildr 1:7 *muna við hilmis hjarðir*, HolmgB 13:7 *rauðk á brynju beiði*), it occurs in the next line (4 lines; e.g., BNjáll 1:3 *dreif á hafskips húfa // húm*), or the verb is part of an impersonal construction (6 lines; e.g., Vígf II, 1:3 *þryngr at Viðris veðri*). Two lines are irregular (TE 4:1 *eru til míns fjǫrs margir*, Eg lv 38:1 *skalat maðr rúnar rísta*), and one line belongs to a *helmingr* with a suspended subject that occurs in line 4 (EVald 2:1 *leit á brattrar brautar // - // - // faðir Þrúðar*). If the line is introduced by a connective, the situation is as follows: subject in position 1 (1 [relative pronoun]), subject in the following line (6), impersonal construction (1), suspended subject (3).

Seventy-two lines out of eighty-two have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6. The percentage of such syntactic units in Type A3² is even higher than in Type A1² (88 percent vs 84 percent), yet Kuhn nevertheless consistently placed a syntactic caesura before the cadence in A3²-lines and after position 1 in A1²-lines (Kuhn 1983:153, 135-37). Again, it is not clear why a line like Korm lv 56:7 *betr annk Sigliságu* should be structured differently than Korm lv 4:3 *bands mank Beiðarindi*. Furthermore, five A3²-lines contain sentence boundaries after positions 1 or 2, but none after position 4. Kuhn, who was not oblivious to the fact that our Type A3² usually has syntactic units in positions 3-6 and occasional sentence boundaries after position 1, argued that these lines had developed a new center of emphasis at the end of the line that obliterated the old caesura between position 4 and the cadence (Kuhn 1983:153). However, we find examples of odd A3²-lines with a nominal phrase in positions 3-6 already in "Ragnarsdrápa" and "Haustlǫng":

Rdr 6:1	mjǫk lét stála støkkvir
Rdr 5:1	þar / svát gerðu gyrðan
Rdr 13:3	svát af rennirauknum
Haustl 18:5	þar hné grundar gilja
Haustl 5:5	en af breiðu bjóði
Haustl 20:1	áðr ór hneigihlíðum.

We must conclude therefore, that the syntactic organization of A3²-lines, as well as that of A1²-lines, was S+S+SSSS; that none of the extant lines of Type A3² shows

any evidence of ever having had a syntactic caesura after position 4; and that, because of this syntactic arrangement, there are no odd lines of Type A2^2.

Because position 1 in Type A3^2 does not alliterate, only a few lines have a nomen in that position (e.g., Hfr III, 15:3 *sverð bitu feigra fyrða*, Hfr V, 9:5 *Krist vilk allrar ástar*). Hence there are only two examples of the word in position 1 modifying the nominal phrase in positions 3-6, namely HolmgB 10:7 *þeir hlutu feðgar fjórir* and Hfr V, 14:7 *bál rauðk Yggjar éla*. The nature of the filler in position 1 (often a bimoric pronoun or an adverb) caused frequent syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2, and both resolution (position 1) and neutralization (position 2) are common.

Odd lines of Type A3^2 apparently served a specific purpose in the composition of *dróttkvætt* stanzas. Unlike sentence-introductory lines of Types E3-4 Verbal, which readily accommodated parenthetic clauses that occupied one line or part of a line (positions 1-4), A3^2-lines more often than not introduce sentences that begin in line 3 and are extended to cover parts of line 4. That is the case with lines in which the finite verb occupies position 2, as well as those with the verb in initial position. The following examples demonstrate that point:

(a) verb in position 1 (11 out of 23 lines):

Hildr 1:7	muna við hilmis hjarðir ‖ hœgr /
Korm lv 29:7	mérs umb erma Ilmi ‖ iðjusamt /
Hróm 2:3	búumsk við Ilmar jalmi ‖ áðr /
VGl 7:3	esat at manna máli ‖ morð /
Vígf II, 1:3	þryngr at Viðris veðri ‖ vandar /
BNjáll 1:3	dreif á hafskips húfa ‖ húm /
Hfr III, 23:3	ferk með lýða líði ‖ landherðar
Hfr V, 7:7	legg'k á frumver Friggjar ‖ fjón /;

(b) verb in position 2 (20 out of 48 lines):

Eyv lv 6:7	nú tregr Gætigauta ‖ grams fall /
Korm lv 46:3	upp heldk Gauta gildi ‖ gǫgnum /
HolmgB 10:7	þeir hlutu feðgar fjórir ‖ feigð /
GSúrs 21:3	átt mun fyrða frétta ‖ fœriván /
Þmáhl 4:3	ván es ísarns ásum ‖ ǫrleiks /
Þmáhl 12:7	leitt erum rauðra randa ‖ regn /
Þmáhl 16:7	vel trúik grímu geymi ‖ galdrs /
Eg lv 41:3	hvar skalk mildra manna ‖ (mjaðveitar dag) / leita
Korm lv 7:7	dýr verðr Fægifreyja ‖ (fimm hundraða) / snimma
Korm lv 49:3	hvat megi okkrum ástum ‖ (annat sinn) / of rinna.

In contrast, very few lines of Type A1² serve a similar function. The special properties of A3-lines that made them suitable for such extended parenthetic clauses will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Eddic *fornyrðislag* contains lines of both Type A2² and Type A3². There is no alliterating stave in position 5 in eddic A2²-lines, and consequently there are no restrictions on the filler of positions 3-4. Consider the following lines: Vsp 2:5 *nío man ec heima*, HH II, 2:1 *hvǫss ero augo*; Vsp 43:1 *gól um ásom*, HHj 35:1 *reið á vargi*; HH I, 56:9 *sigrs oc landa*, Grp 11:7 *Regin oc Fáfni*. The fillers of positions 1-4 in *fornyrðislag* lines of Type A3², with alliteration in position 3, are very much like those of *dróttkvætt* lines (Vsp 31:1 *ec sá Baldri*, Vsp 53:1 *þá kømr Hlínar*, Hym 2:5 *leit í augo*, Fm 33:5 *berr af reiði*, HH I, 17:1 *enn af hesti*, Fm 44:3 *þá er frá vígi*). The filler of position 2 in *fornyrðislag* is, however, much less restrictive (cf. Type A1², above), and such lines as Vsp 28:9 *í inom mæra*, Vsp 46:3 *at ino gamla*, have no counterparts in *dróttkvætt* (see Kuhn 1983:121).

Type A² Even: (80 lines)   A²: $\sideset{_{0}}{}{\mathop{/\!/}}\times\bar{\bar{x}}\times o\times$

Rdr 3:4	draum í sverða flaumi
Eyv lv 12:4	brums at miðju sumri
Haustl 7:8	hendr við stangar enda
Korm lv 63:6	sǫng of mínum vanga
Þjsk IV, 4:8	út of hellisskúta
Þmáhl 10:6	hjaldrs / at vápna galdri
Húsdr 7:4	fyrstr enum gollibyrsta
Hgóð 1:4	hodd ok rekna brodda
Korm lv 8:8	sunds / ok Íra grundar
Hfr III, 10:2	enn / þeirs víðast nenna.

The group of even A²-lines is very uniform. Sixty-nine lines have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6, and sixty-five of these nominal phrases are parts of prepositional phrases (preposition in position 2). In twenty-five lines a sentence boundary falls after position 1, and ten sentence boundaries are followed by introductory elements ("soft sentence boundaries"). The pattern is sentence continuing or concluding, and only two lines are sentence introductory (Korm lv 32:2, Hfr V, 11:6).

Whereas the filler of positions 3-6 in even lines of Type A² is familar from odd A²-lines (nominal phrase), there is a distinct difference in the fillers of positions 1 and 2. Only one even line has a finite verb in position 2 (Hfr V, 11:6 *verðr emk þriggja sverða*), and only three have a verb in position 1 (Korm lv 63:6 *sǫng of mínum vanga*, Þvíðf 1:8 *gall of heiðnum stalla*, VGl 4:6 *gellr í hattar felli*). There is nothing in the structure of even lines that should prohibit a verbal filler of

positions 1 or 2, and the explanation for the avoidance of finite verbs in those positions must be sought in the clause function of A^2-lines. We have seen that odd lines with finite verbs in positions 1-2 are sentence introductory and, furthermore, that they either introduce longer sentences starting in the first line of the *helmingr* (Type $A1^2$ and, in part, Type $A3^2$) or shorter sentences beginning in line 3 and covering parts of line 4 (Type $A3^2$). We have also seen that even lines with a sentence-introductory function contain short parenthetic clauses that cover the whole line or part of the line (cf. Types E2 Verbal, E3-4 Verbal, A2k Verbal): very few even lines introduce a sentence that is continued into the following odd line.[11] Type A^2, with a nominal syntactic unit in positions 3-6, could accommodate one-line parenthetic clauses only with difficulty,[12] and the single example of such an even line comes from Hallfreðr's "sword stanza," in which all lines contain the word *sverð* (sword): Hfr V, 11:6 *verðr emk þriggja sverða*.

None of the three lines that contain a finite verb in position 1 are sentence introductory, and the verbs belong to bound clauses introduced in line 1:

Korm lv 63:5-6	þás slíðrdreginn Sága ‖ sǫng of mínum vanga
Þvíðf 1:5, 8	en við enga svinnu ‖ - ‖ - ‖ gall of heiðnum stalla
VGl 4:5-6	áðr grindlogi Gǫndlar ‖ gellr í hattar felli.

This, then, illustrates one of the main differences between odd and even lines: in odd lines, finite verbs occupying one of the first two positions in the line belong to a new clause introduced in that line, whereas in even lines, a verb in those positions could belong to a short, parenthetic clause (Types E2-4 Verbal, A2k Verbal), but more frequently such lines are sentence continuing or concluding, and the verb is the suspended predicate of a bound clause. Consider the following examples:

TE 3:1, 4	(ey munk glaðr) / síz geirar ‖ - ‖ - ‖ bitu þengils son ungan	(E2 Verbal)
GSúrs 6:1-2	bǫllr á byrðar stalli ‖ brast / (kannkat þat lasta)	(E3 Verbal)
GSúrs 9:5-6	þás Logsága lœgis ‖ lét sinn af hug stinnum	(E4 Verbal)
Rdr 13:3-4	svát af rennirauknum ‖ rauk / (Danmarkar auka)	(D2)
Hást 7:5-6	(þar fekk ǫrn) / en erni ‖ eru greipr hræum sveipðar	(A2k Verbal)
Hfr I, 2:4, 4	ok Geirrótu gǫtvar ‖ - ‖ - ‖ hléðut jarni séðar.	(A1)

Twenty-five even A^2-lines have a sentence boundary after position 1. The internal rhymes occupy positions 1 and 5, and none of the syllables in position 1 is resolved. Only two lines have syllabic cohesion between positions 1 and 2, and none of these lines contains a sentence boundary (Korm lv 32:2 *hví þú skyldir verða*, Hfr V, 24:4 *fley meðal tveggja eyja*).

Type A^2 Even is more common in *lausavísur* than in encomiastic poetry (22 lines), and the pattern was favored by Þjóðólfr (7 lines) and Hallfreðr (14 lines). In

eddic *fornyrðislag*, Type A² was not as common as Type A¹, but the pattern is fairly well represented in all poems in the Poetic Edda. Based on the filler of position 2, *fornyrðislag* lines can be divided into the following groups:

(1) *at, um / of* in position 2:

Vsp 2:2	ár um borna
Vsp 30:2	vítt um komnar
Þrk 8:6	aptr um heimtir
Sg 10:4	gerst um láta
HH II, 44:12	bót of vinna
Hym 38:4	gørr at scilia
Sg 6:4	um at mælaz
HH I, 10:2	vígs at bíða
Br 18:4	mín at biðia
Od 25:4	mín at freista;

(2) connective or article in position 2:

Vsp 26:6	orð oc sœri
Gðr I, 23:4	vers oc barna
Sg 9:2	vers oc beggia
Vsp 20:8	Sculd ina þriðio
Od 8:8	orð iþ fyrra
Ghv 18:8	snør né dóttir
Sg 5:2	lǫst né vissi
Hym 30:4	eitt, er vissi
Grp 21:8	farit, þatz ec vissac
Grp 8:2	gerr, en ec spyria;

(3) preposition in position 2:

Vsp 8:4	vant ór gulli
Hym 10:4	heim af veiðom
HH I, 42:4	gor til rásar
HHj 43:8	beztr und sólo
HH II, 14:8	hugr á vífi
Grp 16:4	víf ór svefni
Rm 18:6	karl af bergi
Fm 44:2	mey und hiálmi
Sg 29:8	gæss í túni
Gðr II, 32:2	greip við orði;

(4) verb in position 2:

Vsp 18:6	óð gaf Hœnir
HH I, 5:8	ec veit noccoð
Grp 11:8	rétt segir Grípir
Rm 18:8	far vil ec þiggia
Sdr 1:2	hví brá ec svefni
Br 12:2	fiǫlð var druccit
Sg 71:8	svá mun ec láta
Gðr II, 5:4	ió frá ec spialla
Ghv 13:2	grǫm varc nornom
Br 11:8	hefnt scal verða.

The first and fourth groups have no correspondents in even *dróttkvætt* lines.

Type A1³ Odd: (32 lines)   A1³: $\|$x$\|$xox

Korm lv 26:1	hefk á holm of gengit
Eg lv 32:1	fell / sás flest et illa
Kveld 1:1	nú frák norðr í eyju
Bbreiðv 3:1	þó mun þǫll en mjóva
Eg lv 34:7	síð man seggr of fœðask
Korm lv 25:1	átt hefk yðr at fœra
HolmgB 13:5	opt hefk ýfzk / þás heiptir
Gráf 2:7	sunnr á sigr of hlynninn
Eyv lv 13:7	ítr / þærs upp of róta
Steinunn 1:7	hregg / þvít hart tók leggja.

Like Type A1², Type A1³ can be sentence introductory or sentence continuing. If a finite verb occupies positions 1 (5 lines) or 2 (19 lines), the line is sentence introductory, and if position 1 is nonverbal and position 2 is occupied by a preposition or a connective, the line is sentence continuing (7 lines).[13] The internal rhymes always fall in positions 1 and 5, and syllabic cohesion can occur between positions 1 and 2 if there is no sentence boundary between the two positions (e.g., Kveld 1:1 *nú frák norðr í eyju*, Bbreiðv 3:1 *þó mun þǫll en mjóva*). There is no syllabic cohesion between the words in positions 3 and 4.

Lines with a finite verb in position 1 can have a sentence boundary directly after the verb (1 line; Eg lv 32:1 *fell / sás flest et illa*), and sentence boundaries after position 1 are also possible if position 1 is nonverbal and position 2 is occupied by a connective (5 lines; e.g., GSúrs 8:3 *Gauts / þess's geig of veittak*). If the verb occurs in second position, however, a sentence boundary can fall only after that

verb (position 3, 3 lines; e.g., Eg lv 11:3 *ótt vas él / þats sóttak*). Kuhn, who always placed a syntactic caesura after position 1 in our Type A1³, claimed that the latter lines with a sentence boundary after position 3 were formed in analogy with A3-lines (Kuhn 1983:137). However that may be, it is clear that the placement of the verb dictated the placement of sentence boundaries. We have seen that, in independent clauses, no sentence boundary could fall before the finite verb, as the following examples from odd lines show:

Eg lv 10:3	þreklundaðr *fell* / Þundar	(E3)
Hfr V, 19:1	lítt *hirði* ek / lautar	(E3 Verbal)
Korm lv 21:7	þá *kysstak* mey / miklu	(XE3)
Vell 22:7	Ullr *stóð* á því / allri	(E4 Verbal)
Gráf 11:5	en ek *veit* / at hefr heitit	(XE4)
Eg lv 11:7	*helt* / né hrafnar sultu	(A1²)
Gráf 12:1	þar *vas* / þrafna byrjar	(A1²)
Korm lv 13:5	*veitk* / at hrímugr hlúki	(A3²)
Bragi II, 3:3	þat *gaf* / Fjǫlnis fjalla	(A3²).

That circumstance explains the placement of sentence boundaries in Type A1³ and also, as we shall see, the placement of sentence boundaries in Type A3³.

Whereas the fillers of positions 1-3 in Type A1³ are similar to the fillers of positions 1-4 of Type A1² (and A1² of eddic *fornyrðislag*), the fillers of positions 4-6 correspond to those of the even *fornyrðislag* lines outlined above. Consider the following examples:

(1) *at* / *of* in position 4 (16 lines):

Korm lv 26:1	hefk á holm *of gengit*
Eg lv 34:7	síð man seggr *of fæðask*
Gráf 2:7	sunnr á sigr *of hlynninn*
GSúrs 8:3	Gauts / þess's geig *of veittak*
Hfr III, 20:7	hætts til hans *at frétta*
Korm lv 25:1	átt hefk yðr *at fœra*
Korm lv 6:7	hrings við Hǫrn *at manga*;

(2) connective or article in position 4 (7 lines):

Eg lv 19:3	reið sé rǫgn *ok Óðinn*
Eg lv 32:1	fell / sás flest *et illa*
Bbreiðv 3:1	þó mun þǫll *en mjóva*
Eg lv 11:3	ótt vas él / *þats sóttak*;

(3) preposition in position 4 (7 lines):

Kveld 1:1	nú frák norðr *í eyju*
Hást 6:7	hjaldrs kom hríð *á skjǫldu*
Hfr III, 12:1	hverr vas hræddr *við ǫrvan*
Hfr V, 16:7	hann esa hlaðs *við Gunni*;

(4) verb in position 4 (2 lines):

Steinunn 1:7	hregg / þvít hart *tók leggja*
Þjsk IV, 5:5	en / þeims upp *réð brenna*.

The syntactic arrangement in sentence-introductory A1³-lines is predictable: in sixteen lines the subjects occur in the introductory line; six lines have suppressed or encliticized subjects (all from *lausavísur*); two verbs are part of impersonal constructions; and in two lines the subjects are suspended and occur in the next line or in line 3 (Hróm 2:7 *oss vas áðr of markaðr* // *aldr*, Eg lv 32:1, 3 *fell* / *[sás flest et illa]* // - // *ulfgrennir*).

Only six lines belong to panegyrics (Haustl 8:5, Gráf 2:7, Húsdr 11:3, Hfr III, 12:1, Hfr III, 20:7, Hfr III, 29:7), and the poetry of Egill (4 lines), Kormákr (7 lines), Bersi (3 lines) and Hallfreðr (6 lines) contains the highest percentages of A1³-lines. Except for the filler of positions 1-2, Type A1³ has no correspondences in odd *fornyrðislag* lines, in which positions 3-4 were occupied by a disyllabic word or a similar syntactic unit.

Type A2³ Odd: (8 lines)   A2³: $//\times\overline{\underset{\circ}{\times}}\times//\times$

Þjóð IV, 2:7	vesið með oss / unz verði
Gráf 11:7	séa getr þar til sælu
EVald 3:1	svá brá viðr / at sýjur
Hfr III, 11:7	skilit frá ek / fyr skylja
Hfr III, 27:5	skiliðr em ek við skylja
Bragi II, 3:1	eld of þák af jǫfri
Haustl 14:1	eðr of sér / es jǫtna
GSúrs 21:1	hverr of veit / nema hvassan.

Type A2³ is rare, and most of the lines are clustered in the ninth (Bragi [1 line], Þjóðólfr [2 lines]) or the late tenth century (Eysteinn Valdason [1 line], Hallfreðr [2 lines]). Positions 1 and 5 alliterate, and the word in position 3 is always nonnominal: either an adverb (2 lines), a pronoun (3 lines), or a verb (3 lines) (see Kuhn 1983:139-40). All lines are sentence-introductory, and the finite verbs occur

in position 1 (1 line; Þjóð IV, 2:7 *vesið með oss / unz verði*), position 2 (4 lines; e.g., Hfr III, 27:5 *skiliðr em ek við skylja*), or in position 3, preceded by the expletive particle *of* (3 lines; e.g., Bragi II, 3:1 *eld of þák af jǫfri*). Because of the syntactic arrangement, a sentence boundary is only possible after positions 1 (if a finite verb occupies that position) and 3. Five lines contain sentence boundaries after position 3, and three lines have no sentence boundaries.

Five lines have no internal rhymes, and in the remaining three lines, the rhymes occur in positions 1 and 5. Four lines have resolution on a verb in position 1 (*vesið*, *séa*, *skilit*, *skiliðr*), and syllabic cohesion occurs both between positions 1 and 2 (*svá brá*) and positions 3-4 (*þar til*, *ek við*, *ek / fyr*). The type is clearly avoided, and the nonnominal filler in position 3 is due to the placement of alliteration (cf. Type A2[1], above).

Type A3³ Odd: (257 lines)   A3³: $\bar{\times}\times\!/\!/\times\!/\!/\times$

Rdr 4:1	flaut of set við sveita
Vst 2:1	mank / þats jǫrð við orða
Eg lv 14:5	verðk í feld / þás foldar
Rdr 10:3	þá svall heipt í Hǫgna
Hfr V, 9:1	mér skyli Freyr ok Freyja
Eg lv 42:3	mik hefr sonr of svikvinn
Glúmr lv 1:1	vel hefr hefnt / en hafna
Gldr 5:5	þás á rausn fyr ræsi
Gldr 4:1	þar / svát barsk at borði
GSúrs 30:5	áðr an mik / þeirs mínu.

Type A3³ is the most frequently occurring filler of odd lines. The type is exclusively sentence introductory, and the fillers of positions 1-2 correspond to those of Type A3².[14] The finite verb can occur in positions 1 (40 lines; e.g., Rdr 4:1 *flaut of set við sveita*) and 2 (192 lines; e.g., Rdr 11:5 *allr gekk herr und hurðir*). In twenty-five lines a sentence-introductory element occupies position 1 (e.g., Rdr 11:1 *ok fyr hǫnd í holmi*).

Lines with a finite verb in position 1 can have a sentence boundary after positions 1 (10 lines; e.g., Korm I, 4:1 *svall / þás gekk með gjallan*) and 3 (8 lines; e.g., Þórarinn 1:1 *sitr við ár / en etjum*). In that respect, A3³-lines differ from lines of Type A1³ in which the sentence boundaries in lines with a finite verb in position 1 always occur directly after the verb. If the finite verb occupies position 2, the sentence boundary always falls after position 3 (52 lines; e.g., Þþyn 1:5 *svá gól endr / þás unda*). In lines with an introductory element in position 1, a sentence boundary can occur after positions 1 (4 lines; e.g., VGl 2:5 *þá / svát dóms í draumi*) and 3 (2 lines; e.g., TE 1:5 *en í kveld / meðan knýjum*). A3³-lines, then,

have fourteen sentence boundaries after position 1 and sixty-two sentence boundaries after position 3.

Four lines have tripartite structures:

Vell 9:1	margt varð él / áðr / Ála
VGl 5:3	þat sá / dóms / í draumi
EValg 1:7	hǫrð / es ván / at verði
Eg lv 28:5	við þann / es bítr / ok blótar.

The first line has caused considerable debate among those scholars who deny the existence of tripartite *dróttkvætt* lines (see the summary in Frank 1985:167-69). However, that odd line displays the exact same structure as even tripartite lines (rhyme [and alliteration] on each side of the embedded word, and the nomen in the cadence belongs to the same clause as the nomen before the sentence boundary). The following examples of tripartite even lines illustrate that point:

Eg V, 1:2	*ljósgarð* / es þák / *barða*
Eyv lv 7:2	*landvǫrðr* / es brast / *Hǫrða*
Vell 12:2	*harðr* / Lopts vinar / *barða*
Vell 16:4	*ríkr* / ásmegir / *slíku*
Korm I, 1:4	*jastrín* / Haralds / *mína*
Þmáhl 4:8	*hnigreyr* / lǫgum / *dreyra*.

Two of these even lines are from "Vellekla," and the first line (Vell 12:2) contains an embedded word in positions 2-4 which belongs to a clause that is introduced in the following odd line (*því kom vǫxtr í Vínu*). There seems to be no reason why Einarr, who, like his friend Egill, certainly experimented with tripartite structures in his even lines, should not have taken that experiment one step further and attempted a tripartite structure in an odd line as well.

The next two lines with tripartite structures roughly follow the same pattern as the line from "Vellekla": the words straddling the sentence boundaries belong to the same clause (VGl 5:3 *þat sá - í draumi*, EValg 1:7 *hǫrð - at verði* || *vápnhríð*), and the embedded words either function as a separate clause (*es ván*) or belong to another sentence (*Limafjarðar dóms Dynnjǫrðr*). Egill's line is more problematic. Not only is it an A-line with anacrusis (which is otherwise unattested in *dróttkvætt*), but the first constituent belongs syntactically to the previous *helmingr* (*ørlygi at heyja - við þann*). Furthermore, the line contains elements that belong to three different sentences, marked 1, 2, 3, respectively:

Eg lv 28:5-8	*við þann*[1](es bítr)[2] / (ok blótar
	bǫnd)[3] / *élhvǫtuð Gǫndlar*[1]
	(alfeigum skýtr œgir
	augum) / (skjǫld at baugi)[2].

All these features may represent bold innovations and a break with the current tradition, but they may also indicate that the stanza is a later interpolation (for a recent discussion of this stanza, see Poole 1991:177-78).

The fillers of positions 4-6 in Type A3³ can be divided into the same groups as those of Type A1³ and even A² *fornyrðislag* lines:[15]

(1) *at / of* in position 4 (30 lines):

VGl 11:1	illts á jǫrð *of orðit*
Korm lv 60:7	drykk hefk yðr *of aukit*
Þmáhl 13:1	vas til hreggs *at hyggja*
Eg V, 1:1	mál es lofs *at lýsa*
Vell 27:1	ok við frost *at freista*;

(2) connective or article in position 4 (86 lines):

Hfr III, 29:1	fyrr mun heimr *ok himnar*
Hfr V, 9:1	mér skyli Freyr *ok Freyja*
Þvíðf 1:1	fórk með dóm *enn dýra*
Eyv lv 5:1	veitk / at beit *enn bitri*
VGl 1:3	þverr við glaum / *enn grœni*
Hfr V, 17:1	lítt mun halr *enn hvíti*
GSúrs 23:5	ok með sér *en svinna*
Hfr III, 4:5	orð vas hitt / *at harðast*;

(3) preposition in position 4 (138 lines):

Húsdr 7:1	ríðr á bǫrg *til borgar*
Eyv lv 2:5	nús / þats rekr *á Rakna*
Eg lv 13:7	sás til ýgr / *af augum*
Haustl 7:1	þá varð fastr *við fóstra*
Hfr III, 4:1	hept vas lítt / *á lopti*
Gldr 5:5	þás á rausn *fyr ræsi*
Hfr V, 24:5	en / þás sér *á Ságu*;

(4) verb in position 4 (2 lines):

Hfr III, 26:1	hlautk / þanns œztr *vas einna*
Gríss 1:3	lítk / hvé sumt *mun sœta*.

Only twenty-eight lines introduce sentences with a suspended subject. Twelve of these subjects occur in the following odd line, most frequently as disyllabic

compounds in positions 1-2 (8 lines; e.g., Húsdr 7:1 *ríðr á bǫrg til borgar || bǫðfróðr*). The remaining sixteen subjects are suspended to lines 3 (8 lines) or 4 (8 lines). If the subject occurs in line 3, it usually occupies positions 1-3 in an A2⁵-line (4 lines; e.g., Rdr 4:1 *flaut of set við sveita || - || hræva dǫgg*). Forty-nine lines have encliticized or suppressed subjects; only four come from encomiastic poetry:

Hfr III, 26:1	hlautk / þanns œztr vas einna
Rdr 7:1	þat segik fall á fǫgrum
Hfr II, 3:1	svá frák hitt / at háva
Vell 4:3	tekit hefk morðs til mærðar.

Two of these lines contain a poetic boast (Rdr 7:1, Vell 4:3), and, of Hallfreðr's two lines, one is part of a personalized eulogy to Óláfr Tryggvason (Hfr III, 26:1) and one a formulaic "I heard" phrase, that is, "affirmation of hearsay" (Hfr II, 3:1).

Because of the variety of syntactic fillers, it is difficult to establish uniform syntactic arrangements for odd lines of Types A1³ and A3³. In accordance with the law of the caesura, Kuhn placed his syntactic caesuras after position 1 in our Type A1³ and after position 3 in A3³ (Kuhn 1983:92). We have seen that, in both types, the placement of the finite verb (positions 1, 2) to a great extent determined the placement of sentence boundaries and that such syntactic breaks could fall after positions 1 and 3. In both types, the majority of lines contain no sentence boundaries (72 percent of all A1³-lines and 69 percent of the A3³-lines, respectively). Furthermore, both types contain fillers that display the structure S+(S+S+S+SS) as well as (S+S+S)+S+SS. Consider the following examples:

(1) Syntactic unit in positions 3-6:

Eg lv 32:1	fell / sás *flest et illa*	(A1³)
Bbreiðv 3:1	þó mun *þǫll en mjóva*	(A1³)
Hfr III, 29:7	kœns hafi *Kristr enn hreini*	(A1³)
Þvíðf 1:1	fórk með *dóm enn dýra*	(A3³)
Korm lv 52:5	hvars nú *baugr enn brenndi*	(A3³)
Eg lv 19:3	reið sé *rǫgn ok Óðinn*	(A1³)
Þdís I, 2:3	áðr drapt *Lút ok Leiða*	(A3³)
Hfr III, 29:1	fyrr mun *heimr ok himnar*	(A3³)
Hfr V, 9:1	mér skyli *Freyr ok Freyja*	(A3³);

(2) Syntactic unit in positions 1-3:

Hást 6:7	*hjaldrs* kom *hríð* á skjǫldu	(A1³)
GSúrs 2:3	*gaukr* mun *Gauts* af slíku	(A1³)
Hfr V, 7:1	*ǫll* hefr *ætt* til hylli	(A1³)

HolmgB 1:3	*þǫll* mun *þann* of kalla	(A1³)
Eg lv 11:3	*ótt* vas *él* / þats sóttak	(A1³)
Rdr 11:5	*allr* gekk *herr* und hurðir	(A3³)
Gldr 5:7	*æfr* gall *hjǫrr* við hlífar	(A3³)
Eg lv 23:1	*þél* hǫggr *stórt* fyr stáli	(A3³)
Þmáhl 7:7	*Gjǫll* óx *vápns* á vǫllum	(A3³)
Vell 29:1	*þrymr* varð *logs* / þars lǫgðu	(A3³).

It is clear that the placement of alliteration facilitated the placement of sentence boundaries after position 3 in odd A3³-lines: in Type A1³, the word in the cadence tends to be nonnominal (59 percent) unless it is part of a nominal phrase (ń+n: *Kristr enn hreini*, etc.), whereas in Type A3³, with alliteration in positions 3 and 5, the word in the cadence may form a syntactic unit with the word in position 3 (ń+ń: *dóm enn dýra*) or it may not (ń / ń: *ǫrn / en erni*).

To put it differently: if, in a sequence of two nomina, the first alliterates without the second (ń+n), the first must modify the second (*herðimýlum*, *styrjar efni*); if both nomina alliterate (ń+ń), they may form a syntactic unit (*kyn kvinna*, *Gætigautum*, *breiðu bjóði*) or they may not (*goð / geira*, *Nefju nafna*, *ǫrn / en erni*). Although Kuhn never says so, it is clear that these rules of alliteration capture the essence of the conditions that prompted the formulation of both the law of the caesura (a syntactic break must fall between the alliterating staves [ń / ń]) and the rule of syntactic coherence (a nonalliterating lift belongs syntactically to the preceding alliterating lift [ń+n]). The same rules of alliteration account for the fallacies in Kuhn's two laws, however. First of all, a syntactic break may fall between two alliterating staves, but, on the other hand, it may not. In alliterative poetry, for example, there is no syntactic cohesion between positions 1-2 in such lines as Vsp 21:9 *opt, ósiáldan* and Vsp 62:7 *vel, valtívar*, but in Vsp 33:7 *vá Valhallar* and Vsp 39:3 *menn meinsvara*, the words in positions 1-4 form a syntactic unit. As is shown by the examples above, the same holds true for *dróttkvætt* lines, and there is no reason to assume that all *dróttkvætt* lines were divided by a syntactic caesura. Second, even if a nonalliterating nomen directly preceding an alliterating nomen must form a syntactic unit with that nomen, there is no evidence that a word belonging to another lexico-grammatical category was subject to the same rules. To give an example: our Types E3-4 and A2k consist of the sequence ń+n+v+x́ (Haustl 18:1 *fjǫrspillir lét falla*, Haustl 3:5 *margspakr of nam mæla*, Eg I, 1:5 *Aðalsteinn of vann annat*). Positions 1-2 or 1-3 are occupied by a compound or a similar syntactic unit of the sequence ń+n. We have seen that positions 3-4 or 4 in such lines cannot be occupied by a nomen, because that filler would result in the prohibited sequence (n+ń) in positions 3-6. There is, however, absolutely no support for Kuhn's contention that these verbs belonged syntactically to the nomina in positions 1-2 or 1-3; rather, as is the case of the law of the caesura, Kuhn generalized certain observations (from the sequences ń+n and ń / ń)

and infused them with unwarranted universality. That explains why a great number of his syntactic caesuras are at cross-purposes with the syntactic organization of *dróttkvætt* lines.

As regards the syntactic arrangements of Types A1³ and A3³, then, we may conclude the following: (1) most lines contain no sentence boundaries; (2) both types display the structures S+(S+S+S+SS) and (S+S+S)+S+SS; (3) owing to the placement of alliteration, the latter arrangement is prevalent in Type A3³.

Type A³ Even: (93 lines)   A³: ⫽×x̄ₓxox

Hfr III, 21:2	muni maðr stríð of bíða
Eg lv 39:6	esat þeir tolf / es skelfi
Korm lv 21:6	misst hefk fljóðs ens tvista
Haustl 8:6	þungr vas Loptr of sprunginn
Kveld 1:2	norn erum grimm / til snimma
Korm I, 3:4	bindr / seið Yggr til Rindar
Eg lv 19:6	Freyr ok Njǫrðr af jǫrðum
Hildr 1:8	hœgr / ef renn til skógar
Hfr III, 3:8	siðr / ok jarl enn þriðja
Eg lv 44:4	borr / en hlust es þorrin.

Structurally, Type A³ Even is similar to odd lines of Types A1³ and A3³. If position 1 is occupied by a finite verb (4 lines), that verb either belongs to a bound clause that begins in the previous odd line (Hfr III, 21:1-2 *né meira // muni maðr stríð of bíða*) or introduces a new clause (3 lines), usually occupying one line or part of the line (Eyv lv 10:8 *fellr á hendr mér elli*, Eg lv 39:6 *esat þeir tolf / es skelfi*).

Forty-one lines have a finite verb in position 2, and these lines can be divided into two separate groups, namely, sentence-introductory lines (23 lines) and sentence-concluding lines (13 lines; = *hjástælt*).[16] All the sentence-introductory lines occur as the second line of the *helmingr*, and nineteen out of twenty-three lines introduce a clause that occupies one line only or part of that line. As the following examples show, these lines are mostly parenthetic comments that provide additional information about the action described in the *helmingr*:

Eg lv 32:2	fót hjó skald af Ljóti
Korm lv 34:2	skald á búð til kalda
Oddr 1:6	sætt vasat gǫr með létta
Hfr III, 20:6	sárr mun gramr at hváru
Haustl 8:6	þungr vas Loptr of sprunginn
Hfr V, 26:6	mjǫk emk vátr / af nǫkkvi.

If the line is sentence concluding (13 lines), there is always a sentence boundary after position 1, and the verb in position 2 introduces a sectional parenthetic clause that occupies positions 2-6 (= Snorri's *hjástælt*; Ht 13, *SnE* I: 618). To qualify for the label *hjástælt*, this line must, according to Snorri, contain a proverb referring to ancient lore (ibid.). However, only the five lines from Kormákr's "Sigurðardrápa" fulfill this requirement. In that poem, the clauses in positions 2-6 refer to Óðinn wooing the giantess Rindr to sire an avenger for the dead Baldr (Korm I, 3:4 *bindr / seið Yggr til Rindar*); to one of the fates emerging from the well beneath the world ash (Korm I, 4:4 *gunnr / komsk Urðr ór brunni*); to Þórr riding in his chariot (Korm I, 5:4 *heið / sitr Þórr í reiðu*); and to an unspecified chieftain (*gramr*) obtaining wealth by means of battle (Korm I, 6:8 *fens / vá gramr til menja*).[17] In "Sigurðardrápa," Kormákr appears to have used the *hjástælt* constructions for his own artistic ends, that is, to provide a veiled juxtaposition of the achievements of Sigurðr jarl, the recipient of the poem, and the mythological events described in the *hjástælt* insertions (Marold 1990:112-18). We can, of course, only speculate about the origin of true *hjástælt* insertions with mythological content, but the earliest *hjástælt* construction might provide a clue: that line belongs to Þjóðólfr's mythological poem "Haustlǫng," and the appended clause comments on the action described in the stanza (the gods' encounter with the giant Þjazi) and asserts, "that was long ago" (Haustl 6:2 *svangr / vas þat fyr lǫngu*). It is quite possible that an innovative poet who was familiar with "Haustlǫng" (Kormákr?) could have picked up on that specific construction and created a stylistic variant that retained the mythological framework of Þjóðólfr's poem. The line from "Haustlǫng" remained known and popular throughout the eleventh century, and King Haraldr harðráði of Norway and his skalds put it to good use in their poetic bantering.[18]

Forty-eight even A^3-lines have no verbs in positions 1-2. Forty-five of those lines are sentence concluding, and twenty-nine contain sentence boundaries after positions 1 (27 lines) and 3 (2 lines). Thus even lines, like odd lines of this type, can have the structure S+(S+S+S+S) as well as (S+S+S)+S+SS (e.g., Þjóð IV, 2:8 *veðr / nús brim fyr Jaðri* and Kveld 1:2 *norn erum grimm / til snimma*, respectively), but the former is much more common. In even lines, however, it is clear that the placement of internal rhymes delineates the syntax: if there is a sentence boundary after position 1, the internal rhymes always fall before that division; if there is no sentence boundary, or if the sentence boundary occurs after position 3, the internal rhyme often occupies position 3, as in the following lines:

Kveld 1:2	norn erum *grimm* / til snimma
Eg lv 39:6	esat þeir *tolf* / es skelfi
Hildr 1:2	nú rekið *gand* ór landi
TE 3:6	þar fló *grár* at sárum
Eg lv 19:2	gram reki *bǫnd* af lǫndum
Eg lv 19:6	Freyr ok *Njǫrðr* af jǫrðum

Eyv lv 12:2	svá hǫfum *inn* sem Finnar
Tjǫrvi 1:2	þat vas *sétt* við glettu
Þjsk I, 1:2	hafizk hefr *runnr* af gunni
ÓTr 1:2	ek fekk *dreng* til strengjar
Hfr III, 3:2	mǫrg kom *drótt* á flótta
Hfr III, 6:2	hann gekk *reiðr* of skeiðar
Hfr III, 21:2	muni maðr *stríð* of bíða
Hfr V, 2:6	svá geta *menn* til hennar
Hfr V, 21:2	hams es *góðr* á fljóðum.

Seven of these lines have syllabic cohesion between the words in positions 1-2, whereas none of the lines with a sentence boundary after position 1 has syllabic cohesion between those positions (cf. Chap. 3, pp. 69-70). However, in lines with a sentence boundary after position 1, syllabic cohesion was possible between the words in positions 3-4 (e.g., Haustl 6:2 *svangr / vas þat fyr lǫngu*, Þjóð IV, 2:8 *veðr / nús brim fyr Jaðri*, Gríss 1:4 *sveimr / meðan ek vas heiman*). This interplay between sentence boundaries, internal rhymes, and words with syllabic cohesion clearly shows the skalds' sensitivity toward the syntactic arrangements of the lines, and it also forces the conclusion that those arrangements must have been marked during recitation.

The fillers of positions 4-6 in even lines of Type A^3 correspond to those of odd lines. Fifty-three lines have prepositions in positions 4-6 (e.g., Korm lv 35:6 *skorð man ek fyr norðan*), fourteen lines have the expletive particle *of* in position 4 (e.g., Eg lv 16:6 *norn til arfs of borna*), six lines have the infinitive marker *at* (e.g., HolmgB 4:4 *angr / á holm at ganga*), five lines have the indefinite article *enn* (e.g., Hfr III, 3:8 *siðr / ok jarl enn þriðja*), six lines have a connective (*ok, sem, eða*; e.g., HolmgB 10:6 *Loptr hné Alfr ok Skopti*), and eight lines have finite verbs in position 4, all of which belong to a new clause that begins in position 2 (e.g., Hfr V, 10:2 *siðr / at blót eru kviðjuð*).[19]

Type A1^4 Odd: (10 lines)   A1^4: $\,//\times//\times$o$\times$

Eg lv 3:1	ristum rún á horni
Sindr 8:5	gerra gramr í snerru
EVald 2:3	œstisk áðr at flausti
Korm lv 42:5	fœrask fjǫll en stóru
Korm lv 16:1	sitja sverð ok hvetja
VGl 10:3	þóttit þeim at hætta
EVald 3:3	jarðar / út at borði
Hást 8:3	ýtar oss at móti
Rdr 9:7	jǫfrum ulfs at sinna
Hfr II, 6:7	blǫkku brúnt at drekka.

The filler of Type A[4] consists of a trimoric+ disyllabic word with an enclitic inflectional ending in positions 1-2, followed by a single syllable ($\bar{\text{x}}$) and a proclitic x plus the cadence; that is, the sequence of fillers in positions 3-6 is similar to that of Type A[3] (S+S+SS). In Type A1[4], positions 1 and 3 alliterate, and the internal rhyme falls in positions 1 and 5. If positions 1-2 are occupied by a finite verb, the line is sentence introductory (6 lines), and, if a nomen occupies those positions, the line is sentence continuing (4 lines). There are no sentence boundaries in introductory lines, but one sentence boundary occurs after position 2 in a continuing line (EVald 3:3 *jarðar* / *út at borði*).

Position 4 is either occupied by a preposition (5 lines), or by *ok* (1 line), *enn* (1 line), and the infinitive marker *at* (3 lines). The syntactic arrangement is predominantly SS+(S+S+SS), and the words in positions 3-6 may form syntactic units, such as *fjǫll en stóru, sverð ok hvetja, út at borði, oss at móti, brúnt at drekka*. Because of the placement of alliteration, the type is avoided: the word in the cadence does not alliterate, and as such (if nominal) it tends to form a syntactic unit with the word in position 3 (cf., *fjǫll en stóru*, and also *flest et illa, hlaðs við Gunni, rǫgn ok Óðinn, Þórs of rúni* [all A1[3]]). However, only a limited number of fillers can accommodate such constructions (*enn, ok,* and, to a certain extent, the particles *of, at*), whereas, if position 4 is occupied by an enclitic inflectional ending (Types A1[1-2]; Rdr 8:7 *bar til byrjar drǫsla* [222 lines], Rdr 15:3 *œgir ǫflugbarða* [86 lines]), there are no such problems. That explains the difference in frequency between Types A1[1] (76 percent of all odd A[1]-lines), A1[2] (72 percent of all A[2]-lines), A1[3] (11 percent of all A[3]-lines), and A1[4] (4 percent of all A[4]-lines).

Type A2[4] Odd: (60 lines)   A2[4]: $\sqrt[\text{o}]{\text{x}}\bar{\underline{\text{x}}}\text{x}\sqrt[\text{o}]{\text{x}}$

Rdr 9:1	bauða sú til bleyði
Eg lv 6:5	leiti upp til Lundar
Hfr II, 4:3	vanðisk hann / ok Vinða
Eg lv 33:1	beitat nú / sás brugðum
GSúrs 26:1	skuluða it / kvað skorða
Haustl 20:5	gǫrla lítk á Geitis
Rdr 1:3	Þrúðar skalk ok þengil
Korm lv 29:1	gǫngu vask of genginn
Korm lv 55:1	baugi varðk at bœta
Hfr III, 28:5	bíða munk / þess's breiðan.

In Type A2[4], positions 1 and 5 alliterate, and the filler of position 3 is always nonnominal (cf. Types A2[1] and A2[3]). All lines are sentence introductory, and the finite verb either occupies positions 1-2 (19 lines) or position 2 (41 lines). Lines with a finite verb in positions 1-2 have a preposition (7 lines) or a connective in

position 3 (10 lines), and eleven lines have a sentence boundary after position 3.[20] If the finite verb occupies position 2, position 4 is occupied by a preposition (29 lines), a connective (5 lines), the expletive particle *of* (4 lines), *at* (1 line), *ok* (1 line), or by a verb (2 lines). Six lines have a sentence boundary after position 3.

Because position 3 does not alliterate (and is always nonnominal), there are no paratactic units with *ok* as a connective, and no lines with the definite article *enn* in position 4. Because only nonnominal syntactic units are possible in positions 3-6, the predominant syntactic arrangement appears to be (SS+S)+S+SS, as in the following lines from Kormákr's *lausavísur*:

Korm lv 29:1	gǫngu *vask of genginn*
Korm lv 32:5	trauðla *mák of tœja*
Korm lv 56:1	vísu *munk of vinna*
Korm lv 55:1	baugi *varðk at bœta*.

Most A2⁴-lines with a verb in position 3 contain the sequence v+PP in positions 3-6, and these lines display no discontinuity of syntax:

Rdr 13:1	Gefjon dró frá Gylfa
Gldr 1:1	hilmir réð á heiði
Gldr 6:1	grennir þrǫng at gunni
Jór 1:1	bragningr réð í blóði
Gráf 4:1	hilmir rauð und hjalmi.

That is also the case in A2⁴-lines with a verb in positions 1-2 (e.g., Eg lv 1:5 *standa upp í stafni*, Eyv lv 2:7 *grípum vér í greipar*, GSúrs 21:7 *drýgjum vér til dauða*). Only eleven lines contain sentence boundaries, and the onset of the new clause is marked by an introductory element in position 4 (e.g ., Eg lv 4:1 *ǫlvar mik / þvít Qlvi*, Korm lv 30:1 *firnat mik / þótt fjǫrnis*).[21] So, despite the occasional sentence boundary after position 3, there is little evidence for a syntactic division (SS+S)+S+SS; rather, Type A2⁴ appears to favor structures without syntactic interruption (SS+S+S+SS).

Unless the subjects of these sentence-introductory lines are encliticized (21 lines) or the verbs are part of impersonal (imperative) constructions (8 lines), the subjects are usually contained in position 3 (7 lines) or positions 1-2 (17 lines). In the latter case, either the complete subject, its base word, or a genitival attributive that is part of the subject occur before the verb. Consider the following lines:

Rdr 13:1	*Gefjon* dró frá Gylfa
Gldr 1:1	*hilmir* réð á heiði
Jór 5:3	*Goþþormr* hlaut af gæti
Gldr 6:1	*grennir* þrǫng at gunni ‖ *gunnmás*

Gráf 9:5	*sendir* fell á sandi ‖ *sævar báls*
Hfr III, 7:5	*hirðir* stózk við harðan ‖ - ‖ *víðis veltireiðar*
Vell 30:1	*flótta* gekk til fréttar ‖ *Fellinjǫrðr*
Eyv lv 9:1	*Fyllar* skein á fjǫllum ‖ *fallsól bráa vallar*
Gráf 2:5	*foldar* rauð / ok feldi ‖ *Freyr.*

This placement of the subject is so common that any listener familiar with skaldic practice would immediately have classified the word in position 1-2 as +subject, regardless of whether it is in the nominative or in the genitive. The completion of the disrupted phrases also follows a set pattern, and the missing base words/qualifiers usually occur in initial position of the following even line, that is, in the same position as most suspended subjects (see Reichardt's vertical placement). That pattern is common from the earliest *dróttkvætt* onward (see Rdr 9:1-2 *bauða sú til bleyði* ‖ *Bætiþrúðr*, Rdr 1:3-4 *Þrúðar skalk ok þengil* ‖ *þjófs iljablað*) and must have further facilitated the comprehension of this type of poetry.

If the subject is encliticized, the lines usually belong to *lausavísur* and the skald himself is the agent of the action described in the *helmingr* (e.g., Eg lv 36:5 *leifik vætr* / *þótt Laufa*, GSúrs 8:1 *teina sák í túni*). Only four lines with encliticized subjects come from panegyrics. Three of these lines are parts of "poetic boasts" or "confirmation of actions" (Rdr 1:3 *Þrúðar skalk ok þengil*, Vell 3:1 *hljóta munk / né hlítik*, Haustl 20:5 *gǫrla lítk á Geitis*), and the fourth line occurs in Hallfreðr's personalized lament of King Óláfr Tryggvason (Hfr III, 28:5 *bíða munk / þess's breiðan*).

Type A3⁴ Odd: (162 lines)   A3⁴: $\bar{\underline{\times}}\times\substack{/\\/}\times\substack{/\\/}\times$

Rdr 3:1	knátti eðr við illan
GSúrs 30:3	gátum hug / við hneiti
Rdr 5:5	urðu snemst ok Sǫrli
Haustl 10:7	váru heldr / ok hárar
Hfr III, 14:1	myndi lung et langa
Haustl 2:5	settisk ǫrn / þars æsir
Haustl 16:1	þyrmðit Baldrs of barmi
Korm lv 32:1	mákak hitt of hyggja
Eg lv 6:3	eigum dáð at drýgja
GSúrs 14:1	hyggið at / kvað Egða.

Type A3⁴ has alliteration in positions 3 and 5, positions 1-2 are occupied by a finite verb, and the type is sentence introductory.[22] Fifty-eight lines have a

sentence boundary after position 3, and one line is tripartite: Gráf 13:1 *kunni tolf /
sás / tanna*. The latter line is similar to Vell 9:1 (*margt varð él / áðr / Ála*) in that
the connective in position 4 introduces a bound clause that is continued in the
following line (*sás // tíðum*), and the words straddling the embedded connective
belong to the same clause (*kunni tolf-tanna Hallinskíða ógnar stafr*). Like
"Vellekla," "Gráfeldardrápa" also contains tripartite even lines (usually involving
the name *Haraldr*; e.g., Gráf 7:6, 10:4), and it is clear that, although such
occurrences are rare, in the more elaborate encomiastic poems odd lines could
contain tripartite structures.

No odd A⁴-line has a sentence boundary after a finite verb in positions 1-2, and
the reason is clear: sentence-introductory odd lines in general avoided hard
sentence boundaries (cf. Types E3-4, C, A2k, A¹⁻²), and the only position in Type
A⁴ that could accommodate an introductory element is position 4. In Type A3⁴,
with alliteration in positions 3 and 5, the words in positions 3-6 could form a
syntactic unit, or they could be separated by a syntactic break after position 3 (see
above, Type A3³). Consider the following examples:

Korm lv 15:5	renndak allt et innra
Hfr III, 14:1	myndi lung et langa
Haustl 16:1	þyrmðit Baldrs of barmi
Steinunn 2:5	hlífðit Kristr / þás kneyfði
Hfr III, 20:1	veitkat hitt / hvárt Heita
Gráf 11:1	fellumk holf / þás hilmis.

So, like Type A3³, Type A3⁴ could have the structure SS+(S+S+SS) as well as
(SS+S)+S+SS, but as in A3⁴ the latter was more common.

Fifty-three lines contain an enclitized subject or verb with a suppressed subject
(first-person plural and mediopassive [-*um(k)*]), and fifty of those lines belong to
lausavísur. Of the three lines from panegyrics, one line is part of a "poetic boast"
(Húsdr 12:3-4 *ofrak svá / [til sævar] // lofi þegna*), and the remaining two lines
occur in Hallfreðr's "Erfidrápa": Hfr III, 24:7 *kannka mart við manna*, Hfr III, 20:1
veitkat hitt / hvárt Heita. In general, Hallfreðr's eulogy to Óláfr Tryggvason differs
significantly from other encomiastic poems in that it contains a high number of
personal asides. Some of these statements fall into the stereotyped categories
"poetic boast" (e.g., Hfr III, 7:2 "en þat lýsik" 'and I declare that,' 23:3-4 "ferk
ek með lýða líði ‖ landherðar" 'I am working on the liquid of the people of the
land shoulder' [i.e., the liquid of the dwarfs = poetry]), or "affirmation of
hearsay" (Hfr III, 11:7 "skilit frá ek" 'indeed I hear that,' 21:1 "sagðr vas mér"
'I was told,' see also Hfr III, 20:5, 8), but most of the clauses with first-person
pronouns reflect Hallfreðr's sentiments about the battle of Svoldr and the death
of King Óláfr.

Consider the following statements taken from Hallfreðr's later "Óláfsdrápa":

Hfr III, 3:1-4:   "þar *hykk* víst til mjǫk misstu gram gengis þrœnzkra drengja" (I truly believe that the king there sorely missed the support of the Þrœndir);

Hfr III, 9:1-4:   "leitt *hykk* Leifa brautar lognárungum váru geirs við gumna stjóra geigurþing at eiga" (I believe it was difficult for the nourishers of the flame of Laufi's road to hold the terror assembly of the spear with the leader of men);

Hfr III, 25:1, 4: "Norðmanna *hykk* nenninn dróttin und lok sóttan" (I believe the vigorous king of the Norwegians is dead);

Hfr III, 5:5-8:   "fellu þar með þolli þeim skævaðar geima *mínir* hollvinir fleiri; meir mein *hlautk* af því" (many of my best friends fell there with that fir tree of the sea steed; I got more grief from that);

Hfr III, 20:1-4: "*veitkat* hitt hvárt Heita hungrdeyfi *skalk* leyfa dynsæðinga dauðan dýrbliks eða þó kvikvan" (I do not know whether I should praise the appeaser of the seagull of the din of the glitter of Heiti's animal dead or alive);

Hfr III, 21:5-8: "væri *oss* heilalíkn ef jǫfurr lifði" (It would be a soothing comfort to me if the king were alive);

Hfr III, 24:7-8: "*kannka* mart við manna veifanar orði" (I do not care much for the rumors of men);

Hfr III, 27:1-3: "Ilts mein þats ulfa sultar optþverri *stóðk* ferri" (It is my great misfortune that I stood far from the frequent diminisher of the wolves' hunger);

Hfr III, 27:5:   "skiliðr em *ek* við skylja" (I am separated from the king);

Hfr III, 26:1-4: "*hlautk* þanns œztr vas einna manna und niðbyrði Norðra norðr guðfǫður orðinn; *ek* sanna þat" (I got him as a godfather who became the greatest of all men in the North under the burden of Norðri's kin; I swear to that);

Hfr III, 28:1-4: "*hefk* þanns hverjum jǫfri heiptfíknum varð ríkri und niðbyrði Norðra norðr guðfǫður orðinn" (I have lost the godfather who became mightier that any war-greedy lord in the North under the burden of Norðri's kin);

Hfr III, 28: 5, 7-8: "bíða *munk* margaukanda mækis móts aldrigi bótir" (I shall never recover from the loss of that increaser of the sword meeting).

There is a great contrast between Hallfreðr's earlier panegyrics to Óláfr and Hákon, which contain only three stereotyped "affirmations of hearsay" (Hfr I, 9:1 "fregnk gǫrla þat" 'I certainly hear that,' Hfr II, 3:1 "svá frák hitt" 'then I heard,' and Hfr II, 4:7 "frák gerðu" 'I heard [he] made') and the wealth of personal asides in his "Erfidrápa." In that respect, Hallfreðr's lament indeed breaks with the encomiastic tradition and is closer to Egill's "Sonatorrek" than, for example, to Glúmr's eulogy to the dead King Haraldr gráfeldr and Sigvatr's "Erfidrápa" to Óláfr helgi.[23]

To sum up: odd lines of Type A3[4] are sentence introductory and contain a finite verb in positions 1-2. If there are no sentence boundaries, the syntactic arrangement can be SS+(S+S+SS) or (SS+S)+S+SS. Fifty-four lines have a soft sentence boundary after position 3. The filler of position 4 is usually a preposition (82 lines) or an introductory element (54 lines), but, as in the other lines of Types A3-4, that position could also be filled by the connective *ok* (7 lines), the infinitive marker *at* (6 lines), the expletive particle *of* (4 lines), the definite article *enn* (3 lines), or by a verb (2 lines, both from Gísli's *lausavísur*). The placement of the subjects is traditional, and only twenty-five lines have suspended subjects, seventeen of which are contained in the following even line.

Type A⁴ Even: (58 lines)　　　　A⁴: $\not{/\!/}\times\bar{\underline{\times}}\times 0\times$

Eg lv 3:2	rjóðum spjǫll í dreyra
Hfr V, 18:4	valda / fúlt af skaldi
Eg lv 39:2	fœrat sex / þás vixli
Þjsk IV, 6:8	hvílask stund ok mílu
GSúrs 3:2	biðkat draums ens þriðja
Rdr 19:4	mœrar skar fyr Þóri
Jór 3:4	magnendr / bjósk at fagna
VGl 8:8	bendir mér ór hendi
GSúrs 17:8	efni / mér fyr svefni
Eg lv 21:8	blóði / Hadd ok Fróða.

Even lines of Type A⁴ can only be sentence introductory if a finite verb occupies positions 1-2 or 3. Twelve lines have a verb in positions 1-2, and ten of those lines are sentence introductory. However, they contain one sentence, and the clause that is introduced in positions 1-2 is never extended to the following line (e.g., Eg lv 30:4 *rjóðum sverð í blóði*, Eg lv 39:2 *fœrat sex / þás vixli*). Three lines have a sentence boundary after position 3, and structurally these even lines correspond to odd A⁴-lines with a verb in positions 1-2.

Nine lines have a finite verb in position 3, but only one is sentence introductory (Eg lv 35:2 *vætti berk / at hættak*). In the remaining eight lines, the verb belongs to a bound clause introduced in an earlier line, as in the following examples:[24]

Rdr 19:3-4	hinns mætygil máva ‖ mœrar skar fyr Þóri
Korm lv 39:5, 8	hvar eldfaldin alda ‖ - ‖ - ‖ varma bauð á armi
Haustl 14:1-2	eðr of sér / es jǫtna ‖ ótti lét of sóttan
VGl 11:5, 8	es óvægins eigi ‖ - ‖ - ‖ Gefnar mák of hefna
TE 4:3-4	hverr ilþorna arnar ‖ undir hlýtr at standa.

One line has a finite verb in position 4 and is sentence introductory: Korm lv 21:2 *beiðis hann á reiði*. This line contains two sentence elements before the verb and violates not only Kuhn's law of sentence particles but also the word order of prose. Other lines, too, contain extraposed sentence elements that may occur before the introduction of a clause, as in the following lines:

Þmáhl 10:6-7	*hjaldrs* / (at vápna galdri) ‖ þurði *eldr* of aldir
Vell 17:2-3	*ímunborðs* / (fyr norðan) ‖ *veðrgæðis* stendr víða
Vell 12:2-3	(harðr) / *Lopts vinar* / (barða) ‖ því kom vǫxtr í *Vínu*
Þþyn 1:2	*hrœs* / es kømr at *sævi*
Þdís II, 1:3-4	*Hvítakrists* / sás hæsta ‖ (hoddsviptir) / fekk *giptu*.

But all these sentences have an extraposed genitive embedded in an earlier line or occurring before the introductory element which signals a sentence boundary. In Kormákr's line, however, there is no sentence boundary, and we must therefore indeed assume a syntactic break or caesura after the extraposed genitive in positions 1-2.

The remaining thirty-five lines are sentence concluding and contain no finite verbs.[25] The syntactic arrangement is SS+(S+S+SS) and ten lines have sentence boundaries after position 2. This arrangement, then, illustrates the main difference between odd and even lines, and between sentence-introductory and sentence-concluding lines: whereas sentence-introductory lines contain a finite verb in positions 1-2 or 3 and can have a sentence boundary after position 3 (Types $A1^4$, $A2^4$, $A3^4$, and A^4 Even [Eg lv 39:2 *fœrat sex / þás vixli*, Eg lv 35:2 *vætti berk / at hættak*]), sentence-concluding lines contain no verbs, and the sentence boundaries occur after position 2 (Type $A1^4$ [EVald 3:3 *jarðar / út at borði*] and most lines of Type A^4 Even). Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, odd lines of Types $A2^4$ and $A3^4$ could not have nominal fillers in positions 3 ($A2^4$) and 1-2 ($A3^4$), and those positions were regularly occupied by finite verbs (= sentence introductory, with sentence boundaries after position 3). In Types $A1^4$ and A^4 Even, there were no such restrictions, and positions 1-2 and 3 could have nominal fillers (= sentence concluding/continuing, with sentence boundaries after position 2).

In even A^4-lines, position 4 could be occupied by a preposition (23 lines; e.g, Korm lv 26:2 *hugðumk þat fyr betra*), by the expletive particle *of* (11 lines; e.g.; VGl 3:4 *vargi opt of borgit*), by the infinitive marker *at* (9 lines; e.g., Hfr V, 10:8 *niðjum Krist at biðja*), by the definite article *enn* (3 lines; e.g., GSúrs 3:2 *biðkat*

draums ens þriðja), by the connective *ok* (6 lines; e.g., Eg lv 21:8 *blóði / Hadd ok Fróða*), or, if a finite verb occupies positions 1-2 or 3, by an introductory element (4 lines; e.g., Hfr V, 28:6 *valdi guð / hvar aldri*). The filler of positions 3-6 is often stereotyped, especially in lines from *lausavísur*:

Eg lv 42:2	arfa *mér til þarfan*
Korm lv 43:8	hlíðar *mér of síðir*
VGl 8:4	vandar *mér til landa*
VGl 8:8	bendir *mér ór hendi*
Korm lv 23:8	hrafna / *mér at tafni*
Korm lv 46:4	gǫgnum / *mik til þagnar*
GSúrs 17:8	efni / *mér fyr svefni*
Bbreiðv 2:2	hríðar *mér at stríða*
Korm lv 25:8	sennu / *mér at kenna*.

Only ten lines come from encomiastic poetry, and six of those lines belong to Bragi and Þjóðólfr. This distribution is similar to that of Type A¹ Even and corroborates the earlier speculation that, just like odd B-lines, even lines with a disyllabic word of the form $\overline{S}\breve{S}$ in positions 1-2 could have been a feature that characterized the earliest *dróttkvætt*.

A large number of odd and even lines with a disyllabic verb in positions 1-2 occur in Egill's *lausavísur*, and they are relatively evenly dispersed throughout the stanzas.[26] Especially prominent are lines that consist of one clause, as in the following examples:

Eg lv 1:5	standa upp í stafni
Eg lv 1:6	stýra dýrum knerri
Eg lv 1:7	halda svá til hafnar
Eg lv 1:8	hǫggva mann ok annan
Eg lv 3:1	ristum rún á horni
Eg lv 3:2	rjóðum spjǫll í dreyra
Eg lv 30:1	hǫggum hjaltvǫnd skyggðan
Eg lv 30:2	hœfum rǫnd með brandi
Eg lv 30:3	reynum randar mána
Eg lv 30:4	rjóðum sverð í blóði
Eg lv 30:5	stýfum Ljót af lífi
Eg lv 30:6	leikum sárt við bleikan
Eg lv 30:7	kyrrum kappa errinn
Eg lv 40:1	bǫrðumk einn við átta
Eg VI, 1:3	hyggi þegn til þagnar.

In Egill's first *lausavísa*, the second *helmingr* contains four such lines. Snorri called that pattern *áttmælt* ('eight-clause pattern'; Ht 10, *SnE* I:614, see Chap. 1, p. 14), but his exemplary stanza contains only one line with a disyllabic verb in positions 1-2 (Ht 10:5 *falla folk á velli*); the other clauses are made up of Types A3² (Ht 10:1 *jǫrð verr siklingr sverðum*), E3 Verbal (Ht 10:2 *sundr rjúfa spjǫr undir*), XE4 (Ht 10:3 *lind skerr í styr steinda*, Ht 10:7 *egg bítr á lim lýti*), E4 (Ht 10:4 *støkkr hauss af bol lausum*), and A2k Verbal (Ht 10:6 *fremr mildr jǫfurr hildi*, Ht 10:8 *liggr skǫr sniðin hjǫrvi*). The difference between Snorri's and Egill's lines is indeed striking and reflects, to a certain extent, the difference between lines from *lausavísur* and lines from encomiastic poetry: whereas, in Snorri's stanza, the subjects are in the third person (*siklingr, spjǫr, lind, hauss, folk, mildr jǫfurr, skǫr*), Egill's lines are subject oriented and usually contain suppressed subjects. It is interesting that most of Egill's lines come from two *lausavísur*, one of which has been judged to be spurious (lv 30) and one usually attributed to Egill himself (lv 1). If the former stanza is the work of a later interpolater, that person must have been intimately familiar with Egill's style and consciously bent on imitating the *áttmælt*-pattern from *lausavísa* 1. Snorri, who was mainly concerned with the placement and characteristics of internal rhymes, could not have been aware of this peculiarity of Egill's, because none of the lines in his *Egils háttr* follows this pattern (Ht 56; *SnE* I:670).

Type A2⁵ Odd: (112 lines)   A2⁵: $//×\overline{×}×//×$

Haustl 6:7	Hirðitýr meðal herða
Gldr 8:7	lǫgðis seiðs af láði
Gráf 13:3	ógnar stafr / of jǫfra
Rdr 4:3	hræva dǫgg / þars hǫggnar
Haustl 19:7	stála vikr of stokkin
Vell 21:3	hǫlða morðs at halda
Vell 32:3	hríðar áss / at hrósa
Gldr 3:3	báru fáks ens bleika
Húsdr 9:3	heilags tafns ok hrafna
Eyv lv 4:3	gumnum hollr né gulli.

Type A2⁵ Odd contains a compound or a similar syntactic unit in positions 1-2 (ń+n) followed by a proclitic preposition (63 lines), an introductory element (22 lines), the expletive particle *of* (7 lines), the infinitive marker *at* (5 lines), the definite article *enn* (9 lines), or a connective (*ok, né, sem*; 6 lines). Positions 1 and 5 alliterate and, unless position 4 is occupied by the definite article (e.g., Þjsk II, 1:3 *Jóta gramr enn ítri*), there is no syntactic cohesion between positions 1-3 and 4-6 (SSS[+S+SS]). Because positions 1-3 are occupied by a compound or a

nominal phrase, Type A2⁵ is always sentence continuing (line 3) (see Kuhn 1983:138). Twenty-eight lines contain sentence boundaries after position 3, and most of them are marked by an introductory element in position 4 (soft sentence boundaries; 22 lines).

As our earlier discussion showed, positions 1-3 in odd lines of Type A2⁵ frequently accommodated suspended subjects, and indeed seventy-one A2⁵-lines contain a suspended subject or part of a subject in those positions. The following examples illustrate that point:

Haust 6:5, 7	áðr *djúphugaðr* dræpi ‖ - ‖ **Hirðitýr** meðal herða
GSúrs 22:5, 7	*mágrundar* kvazk mundu ‖ - ‖ **Hneigisól** af heilu
HelgÓl 1:1, 3	vask / þars fell til fyllar ‖ - ‖ **Ørrabeinn** / en Unnar
Hfr V, 21:1, 3	heim koma **Hirðinaumur** ‖ - ‖ *sævar báls* frá seljum
Oddr 1:5, 7	snarráðan kom síðan ‖ - ‖ **Forna sjóðs** und fœði ‖ *farmr*.

Because of the nature of the fillers of positions 1-3 (usually nominal) and the lack of syntactic cohesion between the words in positions 1-3 and 4-6, the pattern was well suited for the accommodation of disrupted elements. The first internal rhyme tends to fall in position 3 (65 percent), and that tendency is even more pronounced before a sentence boundary (82 percent) or if the word in position 3 is in the genitive (73 percent) (see Kuhn 1983:139). Syllabic cohesion between positions 3 and 4 occurs in lines without sentence boundaries (e.g., Hfr V, 1:3 *ægilig fyr augum*, Hfr V, 5:3 *nǫkðan hjǫr af nǫkkvi*), and it is clear that both the placement of internal rhymes and the lack of syllabic cohesion must have contributed to the clarification of the syntactic organization of odd Type A2⁵-lines. The type occurs in the earliest *dróttkvætt* stanzas (Rdr [3 lines], Haustl [9 lines]), and, because it usually contains parts of longer, interrupted *kenningar*, it is very common in encomiastic poetry (50 lines).

Type A⁵ Even: (132 lines) A⁵: ‖⌣×x̄×ox

Rdr 9:2	Bœtiþrúðr at móti
Haustl 10:6	Ingvifreys at þingi
Haustl 7:4	ǫndurgoðs / í bǫndum
Jór 2:2	herðibrǫgð / en lǫgðis
Eskál II, 1:4	Rínar grjót of þrjóta
Korm lv 14:4	engisax / of genginn
Rdr 3:2	Jǫrmunrekr at vakna
Þmáhl 14:8	œðiregn / at fregna
Rdr 17:2	brautar þvengr enn ljóti
Haustl 1:8	Hildar fats ok Þjaza.

Type A⁵ Even is structured like Type A2⁵ with a compound or a nominal phrase in positions 1-3, and a preposition (83 lines), the expletive particle *of* (15 lines), the infinitive marker *at* (15 lines), the definite article *enn* (3 lines), or a connective (16 lines) in position 4 (see Kuhn 1983:162-63). Thirty-eight lines have sentence boundaries after position 3, and there is usually no syntactic or syllabic cohesion between the words in positions 1-3 and 4-6. Only one line contains a syntactic unit in positions 1-6 (Rdr 17:2 *brautar þvengr enn ljóti*), but extraposed genitival modifiers of the words in the cadence are not uncommon, as in Eg lv 43:4 *arfa Geirs til þarfar*, Sindr 1:4 *Mistar vífs í drífu*, GSúrs 27:2 *þremjahlunns ór brunni*, Vell 8:2 *odda vífs né drífu*. The first internal rhyme occupies position 3 in around 50 percent of the lines. If the word in position 3 is a genitive, however, that percentage is much higher (74 percent), and, as in odd lines, the placement of internal rhymes must have contributed to the delineation of syntax.

Type A⁵ Even is not only structurally similar to Type A2⁵ Odd, but also serves the same function. Fifty-seven lines accommodate suspended subjects or parts of subjects in positions 1-3. In most cases, these elements complete phrases from the preceding odd line (85 percent):

Rdr 9:1-2	bauða *sú* til bleyði ‖ *Bœtiþrúðr* at móti
Haustl 2:1-2	segjǫndum fló sagna ‖ *snótar ulfr* at móti
TE 1:7-8	*þegjandi* sitr þetta ‖ *Þórir jarl* á Mœri
Haustl 10:5-6	gerðusk *allar áttir* ‖ *Ingvifreys* at þingi
Gráf 9:5-6	*sendir* fell á sandi ‖ *sœvar báls* at Halsi.

These examples also illustrate the possible connections between even A⁵-lines and the preceding odd line; that is, the manner in which the word in positions 1-3 can be linked to the statement contained in the odd line. Unless the only sentence boundary in the odd line coincides with the metrical caesura, or the words in positions 1-6 in the even line form a syntactic unit (e.g., an inverted prepositional phrase, as in GSúrs 27:2 *þremjahlunns ór brunni*), the even line can be linked to the preceding odd line in the following three ways:

(1) as an independent constituent or part of a constituent:[27]

Haustl 14:5-6	ók at ísarnleiki ‖ *Jarðar sunr* / en dunði
Eg lv 35:7-8	Ármóði liggr / (œðri) ‖ *ǫldra dregg* í skeggi
Þvíðf 1:5-6	en við enga svinnu ‖ *aldin rýgr* við skaldi
Vell 31:1-2	(háði jarl) / þars áðan ‖ *engi mannr* und ranni
Steinunn 2:7-8	lítt hykk / at goð gætti ‖ *Gylfa hreins* at einu
EVald 1:1-2	sín bjó Sifjar rúni ‖ *snarla framm* með karli;

(2) by means of enjambment:

Korm lv 26:5-6	brast fyr mér *enn mæri* ‖ *mundar vǫndr* í hendi
Hást 3:1-2	*sjau* hafa *sækitívar* ‖ *Svǫlnis garðs* til jarðar
Þmáhl 5:3-4	gnýljómi beit *geymi* ‖ *geirastígs* at vígi
Húsdr 6:3-4	(ramt mein vas þat) / *reyni* ‖ *reyrar leggs* við eyra
Vígf I, 1:7-8	strǫng vas *danskra drengja* ‖ *darra flaug* / til knarrar;

(3) by means of vertical placement:[28]

Eyv lv 8:1-2	bárum *Ullr* of alla ‖ *ímunlauks* á hauka
HolmgB 14:1-2	kominn es *Ullr* við elli ‖ *ǫlnagrjóts* af fótum
Vell 29:5-6	*sundfaxa* kom Sǫxum ‖ *Sækiþróttr* á flótta
Vell 30:1-2	*flótta* gekk til fréttar ‖ *Fellinjǫrðr* á velli
Hfr III, 9:3-4	*geirs* við gumna stjóra ‖ *geigurþing* at eiga.

In the last two groups, the disrupted elements are marked by alliteration, and the syntactic arrangement would surely have been distinct during recitation. Linking by enjambment and vertical placement, as well as the role of alliteration as a cohesive force, will be explored in detail in Chapter 7.

Concluding Remarks

There are relatively few even lines of Types A[1-5]. Lines with an enclitic inflectional ending in positions 1-2 (Types A[1] and A[4]) appear to have been characteristic of the earliest *dróttkvætt* poetry, and only Type A[5], with a compound or a similar syntactic unit in positions 1-3, was common at all times. Unless positions 1 (A[2]), 1-2 (A[1], A[4]), 2 (A[2]) or 3 (A[4]) contained a finite verb, even A-lines were never sentence introductory, and more often than not such verbs, too, belong to bound clauses that are introduced in an earlier line. If an even A-line is sentence introductory, the clause that is introduced in position 1 is usually a parenthetic clause that comments on the content of the *helmingr* or adds additional information, and such clauses are almost never continued in the following odd line.

In odd A-lines, the placement of alliteration determines the syntactic fillers and the syntactic arrangement. If alliteration occurs in positions 1 and 3 (A1), those two positions can have nominal fillers, and the nonalliterating word in the cadence can be nominal and form a syntactic unit with the preceding alliterating nomen (ń+n, A1[1-2]; e.g., Eg lv 19:7 *leiðisk lofða stríði*, Haustl 3:3 *hvat kvað hapta snytrir*). Otherwise the word in the cadence is often nonnominal and separated from the alliterating word in position 3 by a proclitic (A1[3-4]; e.g., Korm lv 6:7 *hrings við Hǫrn at manga*, VGl 10:3 *þóttit þeim at hætta*).[29]

If positions 1 and 5 alliterate (A2), the filler of positions 3 and 3-4 must be nonnominal unless it is modified by a nomen in positions 1-2 (ń+n, A2⁵; e.g., Haustl 9:7 *girðiþjófr í garða*). Hence there are very few lines of Type A2¹ (Hfr III, 10:1 *eigi látask ýtar*) and no lines of Type A2², because such lines would contain the prohibited sequence †n+ń in positions 3-6 (e.g., †*ók at fornum eikum*).

Type A3, with alliteration in positions 3 and 5, avoided nominal fillers in initial position, and such lines were almost exclusively sentence introductory. In lines of this type, the words distinguished by alliteration may form a syntactic unit (ń+ń; e.g., GSúrs 28:1 *hugðak Geymigǫndul*, Rdr 6:1 *mjǫk lét stála stǫkkvir*, Þvíðf 1:1 *fórk með dóm enn dýra*, Hfr III, 14:1 *myndi lung et langa*), or they may not (ń / ń; e.g., Eyv lv 1:3 *oss gerask hneppt / ens hvassa*, Haustl 2:5 *settisk ǫrn / þars æsir*). That is also the case in such odd lines as XE3-4 (positions 4-5) and in Type A1¹ (positions 1-2 and 3-4). This interplay between alliteration and syntax differs from those cases in which a nonalliterating nomen follows directly after an alliterating nomen (ń+n): in that event, the former must modify the latter (Types A1¹⁻² [positions 1-2], A2⁵ [positions 1-3], D2 [positions 1-4], A2k/E4 [positions 1-2], B/C [positions 2-4], E3 [positions 1-3]). There can be no doubt that these circumstances account for the formulation of Kuhn's law of the caesura and rule of syntactic coherence, but unfortunately he extended these rules to cover cases to which they demonstrably did not apply.

The placement of sentence boundaries depended on the syntactic filler of the lines. If position 2 is occupied by an enclitic inflectional ending (Types A¹ and A⁴), a sentence boundary could only fall after position 2 if positions 1-2 did not contain a finite verb (i.e., in Types A¹,⁴ Even and A1¹,⁴ Odd), as in the following lines:

Eg lv 17:4	hótun / Þyrnifótar
Korm lv 34:4	faldin / hrím á tjaldi
Skall 2:7	heitu / hrœrikytjur
EVald 3:3	jarðar / út at borði.

If position 1 or 2 is occupied by a finite verb (odd lines), a sentence boundary could fall after the position:

Haustl 4:3	*hlaut* / af helgum skutli
Gráf 12:1	þar *vas* / þrafna byrjar
Korm lv 13:5	*veitk* / at hrímugr hlúki
Bragi II, 3:3	þat *gaf* / Fjǫlnis fjalla
Eg lv 32:1	*fell* / sás flest et illa
Korm I, 4:1	*svall* / þás gekk með gjallan
VGl 5:3	þat *sá* / dóms / í draumi.

If position 4 is occupied by an inflectional ending (A^{1-2}), the words in positions 3-6 usually form a syntactic unit (nominal phrase). But if that position is occupied by a proclitic (A^{3-5}), all lines, regardless of whether they are odd or even, may have a sentence boundary after position 3:[30]

Eg lv 39:6	esat þeir tolf / es skelfi	(A^3 Even)
Hfr V, 28:6	valdi guð / hvar aldri	(A^4 Even)
Haustl 2:8	bleyði vændr / á seyði	(A^5 Even)
Eg lv 11:3	ótt vas él / þats sóttak	($A1^3$)
EVald 3:1	svá brá viðr / at sýjur	($A2^3$)
GSúrs 31:1	sték of einn / áðr ynni	($A3^3$)
Eg lv 41:1	þverra nú / þeirs þverðu	($A2^4$)
Hfr V, 1:7	stœrik brag / fyr búri	($A3^4$)
Gráf 8:3	foldar vǫrðr / sás fyrðum	($A2^5$).

In general, sentence boundaries were avoided in sentence-introductory A-lines unless the onset of a new clause was marked by an introductory element in position 2 or 4 (soft sentence boundaries). In sentence-concluding and continuing even lines, hard sentence boundaries were much more common, and Snorri's *hjástælt* pattern (Type A^3) is made up of lines with sentence boundaries after position 1. These sentence boundaries were always marked by the placement of internal rhyme (before the sentence boundary), and the absence of syllabic cohesion across the syntactic break. In A^5-lines, too, the placement of internal rhymes (position 3) and the lack of syllabic cohesion must have had a function in marking disrupted phrases (especially genitives) and sentence boundaries.

The fillers of positions 4-6 in *dróttkvætt* A-lines with a proclitic in position 4 (Types A^{3-5}) can be divided into the same categories as the fillers of positions 2-4 in even eddic *fornyrðislag* lines of Type A^2 (preposition, connective, *at*, *of*, *enn*, and verb). The reason for this similarity is not immediately apparent, but will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.

The placement of the subject in sentence-introductory A-lines is similar to that of sentence-introductory lines belonging to groups I-II. We may conclude then, that the skaldic word order was by no means without rules: in independent clauses, the finite verbs occurred as the first or second element (= prose), and the subject or parts of the subject occurred in fixed positions and in close proximity to the verb. In lines that could not accommodate a nominal subject, that is, lines with the sequence v+PP, the subjects tend to occur in initial position in the following even line. That position also regularly contained other disrupted and suspended sentence elements, and this circumstance no doubt accounts for the low number of even A-lines: except for Type A^5, with a trisyllabic nominal phrase in positions 1-3, even A-lines could not accommodate longer nominal units in line-initial position.

The evidence from even A^5-lines indicates that disrupted phrases are usually marked by alliteration, either in enjambment or vertical placement (e.g., Haustl 10:5-6 *gerðusk **allar áttir** // **Ingvifreys** at þingi*, Bragi II, 3:1-2 ***eld** of þák af jǫfri // **ǫlnabekks** við drykkju*), and it seems that alliteration not only governs the syntactic organization of odd lines but also serves as a cohesive force, that is, emphasizing the syntactic coherence of words and phrases that were separated by metrical or syntactic caesuras. The following chapter focuses on the syntactic arrangements within the *helmingr*, rather than in the single line. Special attention will be given to clause arrangements and the semantic functions of clauses (according to the Types described in Chap. 4-6), to syntactic completion (the position of words and phrases that complete earlier disrupted units), and to the means that the skalds employed to clarify the syntactic organization of *dróttkvætt* stanzas.

Sentence Patterns

Beginnings

The discussions of types of fillers in Chapters 4-6 showed that most patterns have clearly defined clause functions.[1] Odd lines are usually sentence introductory (except D1-2 and A2[5]), and, in some cases, the filler of the first position determines the status of the line (± sentence introduction; B, C, A1[1-2,4]), or whether it introduces an independent clause or a bound clause (Types A2-3). In independent clauses the finite verb always occurs as the first or second sentence element (see Kuhn 1983:195). Consider the following examples of introduction of independent clauses from odd lines:

E3	Haustl 18:1	fjǫrspillir *lét* falla
E3 V	Eyv lv 14:5	mest *selda* ek mínar
XE3	Hróm 1:1	út *heyrik* svan sveita
E4	Haustl 9:5	brunnakrs *of kom* bekkjar
E4 V	Eg lv 10:7	helnauð *es* þat / hylja
XE4	Eg lv 24:1	kominn *emk* á jó Íva
B	Haustl 2:7	*vasa* Byrgitýr bjarga
A2k	Eg lv 34:5	Arinbjǫrn *hefir* árnat
C	Vell 5:3	*þýtr* Óðrøris alda
A1[1]	Rdr 10:1	*letrað* lýða stillir
A2[1]	Hfr III, 10:1	eigi *látask* ýtar
A3[1]	Haustl 10:5	*gerðusk* allar áttir
A1[2]	Haustl 5:1	fljótt *bað* foldar dróttinn
A3[2]	Rdr 6:1	mjǫk *lét* stála støkkvir
A1[3]	Hfr III, 12:1	hverr *vas* hræddr við ǫrvan
A2[3]	Bragi II, 3:1	eld *of þák* af jǫfri
A3[3]	Húsdr 7:1	*ríðr* á bǫrg til borgar
A1[4]	Korm lv 42:5	*fœrask* fjǫll en stóru
A2[4]	Rdr 9:1	*bauða* sú til bleyði
A3[4]	Vell 22:5	*ýtti* Freyr af fjórum.

We have seen that, although the placement of the verb in some of these lines apparently violates Kuhn's law of sentence particles (e.g., Eg lv 10:7 *helnauð es*

þat / *hylja*; cf. HH I, 53:1 *svipr einn var þat*, Grp 25:7 *dœgr eitt er þér*), the number of such violations can be greatly reduced if we assume that this law applies only to verbs in ×-positions and not in ×̆-positions, as Kuhn seems to contend.[2] Furthermore, the placement of the verb in independent clauses introduced in position 1 always corresponds to that of prose (V1-2; see Kuhn 1933:59), and such sentence introductions would have been easily recognized by the audience.[3]

In some patterns (odd and even), independent clauses are introduced after a hard sentence boundary. Such sentence introductions are avoided in odd lines, and they occur in fixed positions in even lines. Consider the following examples:

E3 V	Korm I, 6:4	fats / *véltu* goð Þjaza	(*hjástælt*)
	Ormr 1:2	dís / ramman *spyrk* vísa	
E4 V	Korm lv 60:2	Hlín / *sof* hjá ver þínum	
D2	Þmáhl 6:8	unnr / benlœkir *runnu*	
A³	Korm I, 3:4	bindr / *seið* Yggr til Rindar	(*hjástælt*).

All these independent clauses are introduced in position 2, and the verb is either the first or the second sentence element. *Hjástælt* constructions (E3 Verbal, A³) are by far the most common, and Ormr's line, as well as Korm lv 60:2 and Þmáhl 6:8, is unusual.

In odd sentence-introductory lines, no sentence boundary can occur before the finite verb. Accordingly, hard sentence boundaries can theoretically only fall after position 1 if that position is occupied by a finite verb. Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, however, a verbal filler of position 1 only occurs in Types A²-³, and in such lines position 2 is regularly filled by an introductory element, as in Eg lv 11:7 *helt / né hrafnar sultu*, Eg lv 10:1 *gekk / sás óðisk ekki*, Eg lv 32:1 *fell / sás flest et illa*, and Eyv lv 5:1 *veitk / at beit enn bitri*. Hence, as the following examples show, hard sentence boundaries in odd sentence-introductory lines must occur later in the line, and the onset of the new clause is not marked by the presence of a finite verb:[4]

E3	Eg lv 14:1	ókynni *vensk* / ennis
	HolmgB 2:5	randlauki *klaufk* / randa
	HolmgB 7:5	torogætir *'ro* / teitan
	Hallbj 1:1	ǫlkarma *lætr* / arma
E3V	GSúrs 3:1	betr *hugðak* þá / brigði
	Hfr V, 19:1	lítt *hirði* ek / lautar
A1²	Gráf 12:1	þar *vas* / þrafna byrjar
	HolmgB 4:5	gamall *emk* / geira vimrar
	Þmáhl 13:7	lind *beit* / lǫgðis kindir
A3³	Hfr III, 4:1	hept *vas* lítt / á lopti.

If the odd line is not sentence introductory, a new clause can be introduced by a finite verb in position 2, but that is only possible if position 1 alliterates (A1[2]; Korm lv 59:7 *lunds / komk lítlu sprundi*). Even sentence-introductory lines are subject to the same restrictions as odd lines (e.g., Kveld 1:2 *norn erum grimm / til snimma*).

If the finite verb does not mark the onset of a new independent clause, that verb occurs in the following line, in the position it normally would occupy in a sentence-introductory pattern:[5]

E2 V	Þmáhl 13:7-8	lǫgðis kindir ‖ *liðu* Hǫgna vé gǫgnum
E3 V	Eg lv 14:1-2	ennis ‖ ungr *þorðak* vel forðum
	Hfr III, 4:1-2	á lopti ‖ *liðu* ǫrvar framm gǫrva
	Gráf 12:1-2	þrafna byrjar ‖ þeim *stýrðu* goð Beima
	Hallbj 1:1-2	arma ‖ eik *firrumk* þat / leika
E4 V	HolmgB 7:5-6	teitan ‖ *tók* hrafn á ná jafnan
A[3]	Hfr V, 19:1-2	lautar ‖ lundr *hefr* hætt til sprunda
A[4]	GSúrs 3:1-2	brigði ‖ *biðkat* draums ens þriðja.

That is also the case in lines with extraposed sentence elements (cf. Chap. 6, p. 164, above, and Kuhn 1983:202-5), regardless of whether the extraposed element is contained in an odd or even line, as the following examples show:

E3	Vell 17:2-3	ímunborðs / (fyr norðan) ‖ veðrgœðis *stendr* víða
	Eg lv 22:2-3	vígleiptr / (sonar heiptir) ‖ (Blóðøxar) / *rauðk* blóði
E3 V	Korm lv 50:2-3	handarskers / (at berjask) ‖ þú *skaltat* mér þella
	Vell 7:3-4	glaðr / (í Gǫndlar veðrum) ‖ gramr *svafði* bil / (hafði)
XE4	Hfr III, 14:2-3	læsíks / (und gram ríkum) ‖ blóð *kom* á þrǫm þíðan
E4 V	HolmgB 5:7-8	Myrðifreyr / (at morði) ‖ marglyndr *est* þú tǫrgu
A1[1]	Korm lv 1:2-3	menreið / (jǫtuns leiði) ‖ *réttumk* risti / (snótar)
	Korm lv 35:2-3	landvǫrðr / (saman randir) ‖ *várat* virðar stœri
A1[2]	Kveld 1:2-3	(norn erum grimm) / til snimma ‖ Þundr *kaus* þremja skyndi
	Korm lv 27:2-3	(morðvǫnd) / fetils storðar ‖ staðr *esa* strandar naðri
	Hfr V, 22:2-3	snót / (verðk þegns fyr hótum) ‖ vér *munum* dag hvern dýra
	Þmáhl 2:2-3	hræflóð / (bragar Móða) ‖ *rauk* of sóknar sœki
A3[3]	Gldr 8:2-3	(margspakr) / Niðar varga ‖ lundr *vann* sókn á sandi
A3[4]	Eg lv 45:6-7	orð mín / (konungr forðum) ‖ *hafði* gramr at gamni
	Gráf 3:6-7	(sverðleiks reginn) / ferðir ‖ *sendi* gramr at grundu.

It is clear, then, that the placement of the finite verbs (V1-2) always signals the onset of a new independent clause and, moreover, that these finite verbs occur in fixed positions in the different sentence-introductory patterns, regardless of whether or not the clause contains an extraposed element. These extraposed

elements can be independent constituents (e.g., *menreið* [S], *landvǫrðr* [S], *hræflóð* [S], *vígleiptr* [O], *snót* [O], *orð mín* [O], *Myrðifreyr-tǫrgu* [Voc.], *til snimma* [Adv.]), or attributives (*ímunborðs veðrgœðis [ríki]*, *læsíks á þrǫm þíðan*, *glaðr gramr*). Extraposition occurs in bound clauses as well:

A1²	Rdr 6:3	flaums / þás fjǫrvi næma
	Hfr II, 1:3	hraustr / þás herskip glæsti
	Jór 3:2-3	reyr undlagar dreyra ‖ morðs / þás merkja þorðu
A1³	Steinunn 1:7	hregg / þvít hart tók leggja
A3²	Korm lv 7:2-3	(annat) / Beðjarnǫnnu ‖ þats í ljósu líki ‖ liggr /
A3³	Vell 12:2-3	(harðr) / Lopts vinar / (barða) ‖ því kom vǫxtr í Vínu
A¹	Gráf 13:1-2	(kunni tolf) / sás / (tanna) ‖ tíðum / (Hallinskíða)
E4	Vell 9:1-2	(margt varð él) / áðr / (Ála) ‖ austr lǫnd at mun banda
A2k	Hfr III, 21:7-8	(heilalíkn) / ef / (hauka ‖ háklifs) / jǫfurr lifði.

As in independent clauses, the extraposed elements in bound clauses are either independent constituents or attributives. In three lines (Gráf 13:1, Vell 9:1; Hfr III, 21:7), the connective is extraposed, but the word order of the remaining part of the sentence is that of a bound clause, with the verb in final position (*sás tíðum of jǫfra framm sótti, áðr austr lǫnd at mun banda randar lauks af ríki rœkilundr of tæki, ef jǫfurr lifði*).[6]

Certain skalds appear to have favored extraposition more than others. Bersi's *lausavísur*, for example, contain five *helmingar* with extraposition (2:5-8, 4:5-8, 5:5-8, 7:5-8, 9:5-8). One of these *helmingar* (4:5-8) has a variant reading, and scholars have debated which of the two readings represents the original (*Skj* IA:93; Kock 1946-49:51; O'Donoghue 1991:101-02). Consider the following variants:

HolmgB 4:5-8

(a)	gamall emk / (geira vimrar)	(b)	gaman þykkir nú gumnum
	gunnþeysandi at leysa		gunnstœranda at fœra
	(uggik hvergi at hyggja)		(uggum hvergi at hǫggva)
	Hlakkar veðr / (umb blakka);		Hlakkar veðr / (á bǫkkum).

The a-variant contains the extraposed genitival attributive *geira vimrar* that modifies the base word *blakkar* (*geira vimrar blakkar* 'the horses of the river of spears [blood],' i.e., "wolves"). The syntax of the b-variant is less complex. There is no extraposition, and scholars whose goal it is to achieve a simple word order usually prefer variant b to variant a (notably Kock 1946-49:51). However, the b-variant contains certain suspect features. First of all, the second line echoes a line from "Glymdrápa" (Gldr 1:6 *gnýstœrandi fœri*). Second, the initial line is Type E3 Verbal (*gaman þykkir nú gumnum*), which is never used by Bersi, who favors Types XE3-4, A3³, and A1². In contrast, Kormákr's *lausavísur* contain fifteen

sentence-introductory E3 Verbal-lines, and the two *helmingar* that constitute a verbal exchange between him and Steingerðr, the latter of which most scholars deem to be spurious, are introduced by odd E3 Verbal-lines (Korm lv 19:1 † *hvern myndir þú Hrundar*, Steing 1:1 *bræðr mynda ek blindum*). Extraposition was a device favored by Bersi, and there is no reason to discount the authenticity of the a-variant because of its complexity of word order; rather, unlike the b-variant, variant a displays features characteristic of Bersi's poetry (extraposition, Type $A1^2$ in sentence introduction). It is likely, therefore, that the former is the work of a later interpolator and that the a-variant belonged to the original stanza.

Extraposition was subject to the strict rule that no more than one sentence element or one attributive belonging to a sentence could be extraposed before the onset of that sentence. That extraposed element could consist of more than one word (e.g., *reyr undlagar dreyra*, *Lopts vinar*, *geira vimrar*), but those words must form a nominal phrase and occur together as a unit. The patterns of extraposition are in reality more complex variants of such inverted nominal, verbal, and prepositional phrases as Hfr II, 1:6 *hjǫrva gnýs ok skýjum*, Sindr 1:4 *Mistar vífs í drífu*, GSúrs 27:2 *þremjahlunns ór brunni*, Vell 25:2 *gammi nás und hramma*, Hást 6:7 *hjaldrs kom hríð á skjǫldu*, and Rdr 7:3 *Ræs gǫfumk reiðar mána*. As such they were certainly familiar to an audience schooled in the intricacies of skaldic word order and could not have presented significant problems for the comprehension of *dróttkvætt* stanzas.

The onset of bound clauses is always marked by introductory elements, that is, by conjunctions, particles (the relative *es*), interrogatives, or adverbs (see Kuhn 1933:30, 50-51). Kuhn's law of sentence introduction, according to which no proclitic formword could appear in sentence introduction (Kuhn 1983:202), is usually strictly enforced in *dróttkvætt* lines.[7] Unlike proclitic formwords, which only occur in ×-positions, introductory elements occupy ×-positions as well as x̄-positions (A-lines). In Types B, C, $A1^2$, and $A3^{2-3}$, bound clauses are introduced in initial position, as in the following lines:

B	Rdr 8:5	*þás* Hristisif hringa
C	Eyv lv 4:5	*ef* søkkspenni svinnan
$A1^2$	Korm lv 2:5	*enn* til ǫkkla svanna
$A3^2$	Vell 28:5	*þás* með Frísa fylki
$A3^3$	Gldr 5:5	*þás* á rausn fyr ræsi.

Line internally, bound clauses can be introduced only in an ×-position, that is, in positions 2 (A^{2-3}), 3 (E4, XE4), and 4 (A^{3-5}):

$A1^2$	Hfr III, 3:3	gram / *þanns* gunni framði
$A3^2$	Eg lv 10:1	gekk / *sás* óðisk ekki
A^2	Hfr III, 10:2	enn / *þeirs* víðast nenna

A1³	GSúrs 8:3	Gauts / *þess's* geig of veittak
	HolmgB 13:5	opt hefk ýfzk / *þás* heiptir
A2³	EVald 3:1	svá brá viðr / *at* sýjur
A3³	Korm I, 4:1	svall / *þás* gekk með gjallan
	Glúmr lv 1:1	vel hefr hefnt / *en* hafna
A³	Eskál IV, 1:2	vǫrð / *þanns* sitr at jǫrðu
A1⁴	Eg lv 41:1	þverra nú / *þeirs* þverðu
A2⁴	Hfr III, 28:5	bíða munk / *þess's* breiðan
A3⁴	Gráf 11:1	fellumk hǫlf / *þás* hilmis
A⁴	Hfr V, 28:6	valdi guð / *hvar* aldri
A2⁵	Vell 18:3	Gætinjǫrðr / *sás* gerði
A⁵	Haustl 14:6	Jarðar sunr / *en* dunði
E4	Gráf 3:2	allvaldr / *sás* gaf skǫldum
E4V	Þmáhl 15:2	ek veit / *at* gat beitu
XE4	Gráf 11:5	en ek veit / *at* hefr heitit.

The placement of the finite verbs in bound clauses is not restricted to V1-2, and such verbs may be suspended to a later line (Kuhn 1933:59-60; 1983:118-19, see Chap. 4, p. 98-99). However, the placement of finite verbs in bound clauses, too, is to a certain extent predictable. If the bound clause is introduced in an even line, more than 90 percent of the finite verbs occur in that same line, usually in positions 5-6, as in the following examples:

GSúrs 19:6	vekjendr / þeirs mik *sekðu*
Korm I, 4:2	Gauts eld / hinns styr *beldi*
Oddr 2:2	svellendr / en þar *fellu*
Gráf 3:2	allvaldr / sás *gaf* skǫldum
Hfr V, 10:2	siðr / at blót *eru* kviðjuð.

If the bound clause is introduced in an odd line, slightly less than 50 percent of those lines contain the finite verb (e.g., Haustl 18:7 *en Bergdana bægði*, Hfr III, 5:1 *sótti herr / þars hætti*); around 37 percent of the verbs occur in the following even line (e.g., Rdr 10:5-6 *es þrymregin þremja // þróttig Heðin sóttu*, HolmgB 2:1-2 *muna munt hjaldr / þanns Hildar // háraddar mik kvaddir*); and 13 percent of the finite verbs are suspended from line 1 to line 4, as in the following two *helmingar*:

Rdr 17:1-4	ok borðróins barða
	brautar þvengr enn ljóti
	á haussprengi Hrungnis
	harðgeðr neðan *starði*.

Vell 26:1-4   hitt vas auk / at eykir
                     aurborðs á vit norðan
                     und sigrrunni svinnum
                     sunnr Danmarkar *runnu*.

Less than 4 percent of the suspended finite verbs occur in line 3, and the reason is
clear: odd lines were sentence introductory, and the finite verbs occupied fixed
positions. Hence such lines were poorly suited to accommodate suspended verbal
elements from an earlier line. When suspended finite verbs do occur in line 3, they
are usually accompanied by the subject or parts of the subject, and the line is either
sentence concluding, or there is a strong syntactic coherence between lines 3 and 4.
Consider the two *helmingar* from the *lausavísur* by Torf-Einarr and Egill:

TE 1:5-8   en í kveld / (meðan knýjum)
                    of kerstraumi / (rómu)
                    þegjandi *sitr* þetta
                    Þórir jarl á Mœri.

Eg lv 32:1-4   (fell) / sás flest et illa
                    (fót hjó skald af Ljóti)
                    (ulfgrennir) / *hefr unnit*
                    (eir veittak Friðgeiri).

If the bound clause is introduced in the first line of the *helmingr* and the third line
is occupied by a parenthetic clause, only around 5 percent of the half-stanzas have
a finite verb in line 4: in most cases, the finite verb is introduced before the
syntactic break, as in the examples below:

Haustl 15:5-8   þás hofregin hafrar
                    hógreiðar framm *drógu*
                    (seðr gekk Svǫlnis ekkja
                    (sundr) / at Hrungnis fundi.

Hfr V, 20:1-4   (veitkat hitt) / hvat verða
                    verglóðar *skal* Móða
                    (rinnumk ást til Ilmar
                    (unnar dags) / á munni.

In such *helmingar*, the words that conclude line 4 are immediate constituents of the
verbs (*drógu at Hrungnis fundi*, *verða skal á munni*). Consider the following
examples: Glúmr lv 1:5, 8 *drekka - Hákonar dreyra*, VGl 6:5, 8 *jósu - framm
blóði*, Þmáhl 3:5, 8 *næðak - Vermundi*, GSúrs 21:5, 8 *segja - Þórketil ráðinn*,

Þmáhl 11:5-6, 8 *myndi - vilja - á sjó hlaupa*, Hfr III, 23:5-6, 8 *myndi - koma - ór styr slíkum*. More than 60 percent of all the finite verbs in bound clauses occupy the cadence (see Kuhn 1933:60), and, if the infinitives and participles occurring in the cadence are added to this number, the percentage is considerably higher.

There are some rather significant syntactic differences between the bound clauses introduced in initial position (Types B, C, A1^2, A3$^{2-3}$) and clauses introduced in a medial position after a sentence boundary. Types B, C, A1^2, and A3$^{2-3}$ are much more likely to introduce longer sentences that are concluded in line 4, and, conversely, a bound clause that is introduced after a sentence boundary tends to be less complex and occupies one or two lines. Consider the following half-stanzas from "Vellekla":

Vell 21:1-4	búinn lézk valdr / (ef vildi
	valmey konungr heyja)
	hǫlða morðs at halda
	(herr fell of gram) / velli.
Vell 27:5-8	þás valserkjar virki
	veðrhirði bað stirðan
	fyr Hlymnjǫrðum hurðar
	Hagbarða gramr varða.

If a bound clause is introduced line-internally in the first line of the *helmingr*, the initial sentence (introduced in position 1) is usually the dominant clause that continues throughout the half-stanza (around 50 percent), as in the following *helmingar*:

Eg lv 14:5-8	verðk í feld / (þás foldar
	faldr kømr í hug skaldi
	Bergóneris) / brúna
	brátt miðstalli hváta.
Glúmr lv 1:1-4	vel hefr hefnt / (en hafna
	hjǫrs berdraugar fjǫrvi)
	(folkrakkr of vann fylkir
	framligt) / Haraldr Gamla.

If the first clause is a short, independent clause that is terminated in positions 2-3 (21 percent), or if it contains a *verbum dicendi* or *sentiendi* and the second clause functions as the object of the first (18 percent), the second clause is the dominant clause, as the following examples show:

Vell 25:1-4 (strǫng vas gunnr) / áðr Gunnar
        gammi nás und hramma
        þrøngvimeiðr of þryngvi
        þrimr hundruðum lunda.

Eyv lv 5:1-4 (veitk) / at beit enn bitri
        byggving meðaldyggvan
        bulka skíðs ór báðum
        benvǫndr konungs hǫndum.

If the first clause is not terminated in the first line, the second clause only rarely takes precedence in the *helmingr* (ca. 10 percent). In such cases, the first clause is either continued in the second line, or it contains a suspended element that occurs in lines 3 or 4. Consider the following two half-stanzas from *Egils saga*:

Skall 2:1-4 (mjǫk verðr ár) / sás aura
        (ísarns meiðr at rísa)
        váðir Vidda bróður
        veðrseygjar skal kveðja.

Eg lv 36:1-4 (drekkum ór) / þótt Ekkils
        eykríðr beri tíðum
        horna sund at hendi
        (hvert full) / bragar Ulli.

To sum up: the onset of independent clauses is always marked by the finite verb (V1-V2), and no sentence boundary can occur before that verb. The placement of the verb in patterns that introduce independent clauses is fixed (positions 1, 1-2, 2, 2-3, 3, 3-4, or 4), and the verb will occupy its fixed position regardless of whether or not the clause contains an extraposed element in a previous line. Such extraposed elements, then, have no influence on the syntax, and, as a rule, no more than one sentence element or part of a sentence element (attributive) can be extraposed.

Bound clauses are marked by proclitic introductory elements. Such introductory elements can occur in line-initial position (Types B, C, A1^2, A3$^{2-3}$) or in a medial position (Types A$^{2-5}$, E4, and XE4). Although the finite verbs in bound clauses are not restricted to position 1 or 2, their placement is usually quite predictable. Bound clauses introduced in even lines tend to be short and the finite verbs are contained in that line. If the bound clause is introduced in an odd line, the finite verb occurs in that line, in the next line, or in line 4, usually occupying the cadence. Very few suspended verbs occur in line 3, because such a placement would cause syntactic confusion (if the third line contained a verb, it was sentence introductory). Most

finite verbs in bound clauses occur before a subsequent sentence boundary, and, just as in independent clauses, it is clear that the finite verb is the structural core of the *helmingr*. Bound clauses that are introduced in initial position in odd lines are usually longer than those that are introduced in a medial position, and clauses of the latter type are rarely the semantically dominant clauses of the *helmingar*.

The placement of the verbs in eddic *fornyrðislag* lines is similar to that of *dróttkvætt*. Consider the following examples:

E3	Vsp 32:5-6	Baldrs bróðir *var* ‖ of borinn snemma
E3 V	Hym 13:5	fram *gengo* þeir
E4	Br 19:1-2	benvǫnd *of lét* ‖ brugðinn gulli
E4 V	HH I, 53:1	svipr einn *var* þat
	HH I, 2:1	nótt *varð* í bœ
B	Vsp 50:3-4	*snýz* iǫrmungandr ‖ í iǫtunmóði
	Vsp 2:3-4	þá er forðom mic ‖ fœdda *hǫfðo*
A2k	Vsp 52:5	griótbiǫrg *gnata*
C	Vsp 27:1-2	*veit* hon Heimdalar ‖ hlióð um fólgit
	Vsp 4:1-2	áðr Burs synir ‖ biǫðom *um yppo*
A1[1]	HH II, 6:5-6	*bíðom* byriar ‖ í Brunavágom
A2[1]	Vsp 7:5	afla *lǫgðo*
A3[1]	Gðr I, 2:1-2	*gengo* iarlar ‖ alsnotrir fram
A1[2]	Vsp 2:1-2	ec *man* iǫtna ‖ ár um borna
	Vsp 52:3-4	*scínn* af sverði ‖ sól valtíva
	HH II, 48:5-6	er þú á armi ‖ ólifðom *sefr*
A2[2]	Vsp 1:1-2	hlióðs *bið* ec allar ‖ helgar kindir
	Vsp 43:1-2	*gól* um ásom ‖ Gullinkambi
A3[2]	HH I, 7:5-6	siálfr *gecc* vísi ‖ ór vígþrimo
	Vsp 37:1-2	*stóð* fyr norðan ‖ á Niðavǫllom
	Hym 34:7-8	enn á hælom ‖ hringar *scullo*.

In independent clauses, the finite verbs usually occur as the first or second sentence element, and their position in sentence-introductory patterns is similar to that of sentence-introductory *dróttkvætt* lines. In some cases, however, the finite verbs can occur further back, as in the following lines (see Kuhn 1933:61-62):

E3	Grp 34:5-6	fullqvæni þá ‖ fylkir *væri*
	Sdr 1:5-6	Sigmundar burr ‖ *sleit* fyr scǫmmo
D2	Hym 18:5-6	sveinn sýsliga ‖ *sveif* til scógar
	Gðr I, 24:5-6	urðr ǫðlinga ‖ *hefir* þú æ verið
	Sg 4:9-10	mey frumunga ‖ *fal* hann megi Giúca
	Gðr II, 16:1-2	scip Sigmundar ‖ *scriðo* frá landi
A2k	Br 11:7	heiptgiarns hugar ‖ hefnt *scal verða*.

Most of these lines contain a nominal phrase in positions 1-4, and, because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, they have no correspondents in *dróttkvætt* lines. In bound clauses, the finite verbs occur in positions 3-4 (e.g., Vsp 8:5 *unz þriár qvómo*) or in the next line, preferably in positions 3-4 (e.g., Vsp 21:3-4 *er Gullveigo || geirom studdo*) (see Kuhn 1933:53-54).

The main differences between stanzas in *fornyrðislag* and *dróttkvætt* are that the eddic sentences are much shorter, that sentence intercalation is rare, and that even lines frequently introduce new clauses, often of Type B or C. In that respect, the syntax of eddic *fornyrðislag* is closer to the skaldic meters *kviðuháttr* and *runhent*, which contain fewer syllables per line and where the main stave in even lines is not fixed in initial position.

Parenthetic Clauses

Bound clauses introduced in initial position, line 1, are usually longer sentences that are continued throughout the *helmingr*. That is also the case with independent clauses introduced by Types E3-4 and A2k. Parenthetic clauses, that is, clauses that occupy one line (one-line clauses) or part of a line other than line 1 (sectional clauses), are accommodated by other patterns.[8] In the third line, one-line parenthetic clauses tend to occur in Types E3 Verbal, XE3, A1[2], A3[3], as in the following examples:

E3 V	Korm lv 2:3	oss hlœgir þat eigi
	Hfr V, 13:7	ek of hefnða svá okkar
XE3	Eg lv 21:3	meir varðak fé forðum
	HolmgB 1:7	vér bárum hlut hæra
A1[2]	Þþyn 1:3	móðr krefr morginbráðar
	Hfr V, 3:3	mjǫk skýtr Mǫrnar vakri
A3[3]	GSúrs 34:7	oss gein hjǫrr of hjassa
	Korm lv 31:7	minn leikr hugr á henni.

Most of these one-line clauses come from *lausavísur*. They furnish additional, but unnecessary information about the events described in the *helmingr*, usually from the point of view of the poet. In encomiastic poetry, such clauses also provide parenthetic asides with little relevance to the main message of the stanza. Consider the following examples:

E3 V	Hfr II, 2:3	hvat of dylði þess hǫldar
XE3	Gldr 5:3	rauð fnýsti ben blóði
A1[2]	Haustl 14:7	móðr svall Meila blóða
	Hfr III, 22:7	menn geta máli sǫnnu

A3³	Rdr 10:3	þá svall heipt í Hǫgna
	Gldr 5:7	æfr gall hjǫrr við hlífar
	Jór 1:3	hús hlutu opt fyr eisum
	Gráf 3:3	hann fekk gagn at gunni.

When such one-line clauses occur in other patterns, their semantic content is not significantly different:

E3	Korm lv 10:3	grepps reiðu mank góða
	Gráf 6:3	naddskúrar vas nœrir
XE4	Korm lv 59:3	þás vér of fen fórum
	Hfr III, 13:7	hvars skríðr með lið lýða
A3¹	GSúrs 36:3	skekkik dverga drykkju
	Hfr III, 12:3	óðusk malmþings meiðar
A1³	HolmgB 8:3	nauðr hagar nú til frœða
	Hfr III, 20:7	hætts til hans at frétta.

There can be no doubt that the parenthetic clauses in line 3 are mere fillers, that is, they provided the skalds with the means to complete the third line with words that would furnish the necessary alliteration for the completion of the main clause in line 4 at the end of the *helmingar* (see Kuhn 1983:194). The following two stanzas illustrate that point:

Gráf 6	braut við brynju njóta
	bág rifjunga Ságu
	(naddskúrar vas nœrir)
	Nóregs konungr stóra;
	valgaltar lét velta
	vargfœðandi marga
	(ofvæginn réð jǫfri)
	jafnborna sér þorna.

Hfr V, 13	svá hefk hermila harma
	Hnigbaldr í gný skjalda
	(baugs erum svipr at sveigi)
	sárlinns rekit minna;
	at lofhnugginn liggja
	létk sunnr í dyn Gunnar
	(ek of hefnða svá okkar)
	Auðgísls bana dauðan.

All four *helmingar* consist of one long sentence that occupies lines 1-2+4, and the parenthetic clauses in the third line allow the poets to accommodate the semantically and syntactically necessary elements *Nóregs konungr*, *jafnborna sér*, *sárlinns*, and *Auðgísls bana*. Furthermore, these four parenthetic clauses illustrate the main difference between such insertions in panegyrics and in *lausavísur*: whereas Hallfreðr comments on his own sentiments and actions ("I miss that mover of the ring," "thus I avenged the two of us"), Glúmr's two asides focus on the accomplishments of Haraldr gráfeldr ("he was the nourisher of the spear storm," "the overpowering one chastised the chieftain").

One-line clauses rarely occur in the first line unless the the whole *helmingr* or most of the *helmingr* is made up of short clauses (*áttmælt* 'eight-clause pattern'), as in the following two half-stanzas by Egill and Þórbjǫrn dísarskald (see also Eyv lv 10 [p. 59 above] and GSúrs 16 [p. 189 below]):

Eg lv 30:1-4	hǫggum hjaltvǫnd skyggðan /
	hœfum rǫnd með brandi /
	reynum randar mána /
	rjóðum sverð í blóði / .

Þdís I, 2:1-4	ball í Keilu kolli /
	Kjallandi brauzt alla /
	áðr drapt Lút ok Leiða /
	lézt dreyra Búseyru / .

As we have seen, such short sentences of Type A (odd and even) were especially favored by Egill, and he also has his share of the few *helmingr*-initial XE3- and E4-lines (Eg 1:1 *þat mælti mín móðir*, Eg I, 1:5 *Aðalsteinn of vann annat*).

Most of the one-line parenthetic clauses in even lines are contained in line 2, and, in view of the fact that line 4 is usually occupied by elements that complete the main sentence of the *helmingr* (see below), that circumstance is not surprising. Because these short independent clauses must contain finite verbs (V1 or V2), they could only be accommodated by certain types of fillers, that is, the sentence-introductory Types E2-4 Verbal, A2k Verbal, and A3 (with a verb in positions 1 or 2), and, much more rarely, Types E3 and D2 (if a finite verb occupied position 1 or 4). Although Types E4 and A2k technically could accommodate one-line clauses if positions 3 and 3-4 contained a finite verb, lines of these types clearly fulfilled other functions (see below), and as even lines they are either sentence continuing or concluding. The semantic character of even one-line clauses is similar to that of the odd lines discussed above, and, as the following examples show, there is again a significant difference between the content of clauses from panegyrics and *lausavísur*:

E2 V	Skall 3:2	ák sveigar kǫr deiga
	Þmáhl 17:6	sék þeira lið meira
E3 V	Hallbj 1:6	bǫl gervir mik fǫlvan
	Vell 33:2	glaðar þengill her drengja
E4 V	Eg lv 28:2	fǫrum holms á vit sǫrvar
	Hfr I, 4:2	ferr jǫrð und menþverri
A2k V	Hfr V, 9:6	erumk leið sonar reiði
	Jór 1:2	beið herr konungs reiði
A^3	Hfr V, 28:2	ungr vask harðr í tungu
	Hfr III, 6:2	hann gekk reiðr of skeiðar.

We noted earlier that the substance of even one-line clauses of Types E3-4 and A2k is usually stereotyped, and that the skalds to a great extent must have relied on a stock of formulaic phrases that could be varied to fit the purposes of rhyme and alliteration. That is also the case with one-line clauses of Type E2 Verbal, especially in *lausavísur*:[9]

Skall 3:2	ák sveigar kǫr deiga
Hást 5:2	ák þunnan hjǫr Gunnar
Hfr V, 5:4	nú ák Sýrar mey dýra
Korm lv 25:4	varð þeira hlutr meiri
Þmáhl 17:6	sék þeira lið meira.

Such verbal echoes are rare in lines of Type A^3, and it could be that, because of their structure, E- and A2k-lines lend themselves more easily to memorization and could be applied when needed during extemporaneous composition without distracting too much attention from the main substance of the *helmingr*. One-line parenthetic clauses in odd lines are seldom formulaic, and it seems that the demands of two alliterating staves (to accommodate the word carrying the main stave in line 4) might have caused the poets to exert more skill in devising such fillers.

Just as one-line clauses in odd lines accommodate the metrical scheme and furnish the necessary alliteration for the concluding statement in line 4, in even lines, one-line clauses provide a similar relief for sentences introduced in line 1, as the following two *helmingar* from Hallfreðr's poetry show:

Hfr III, 3:1-4	þar hykk víst til mjǫk misstu
	(mǫrg kom drótt á flótta)
	gram / (þanns gunni framði)
	gengis þrœnzkra drengja.

Hfr V, 2:5-8   síð mun Surts of bíða
                      (svá geta menn til hennar)
                      kvánar byrr af kyrri
                      Kolfinnu mér rinna.

Parenthetic clauses that occupy parts of a line (sectional clauses) can be as short as two words (e.g., Eg V, 1:2 *ljósgarð / es þák / barða*) and as long as four words (e.g., Haustl 6:2 *svangr / vas þat fyr lǫngu*, Haustl 13:4 *sveipr varð í fǫr / Greipar*), but, as a rule, they must contain a finite verb (see Kuhn 1983:189). Therefore such sectional clauses can only be accommodated by patterns in which a verb can occur before or after the syntactic break (Types E2-4 Verbal, E4 Even, XE3, A2k Verbal, and A$^{2-5}$). Sectional clauses that occupy line 3 are relatively rare. In E-lines, they cover positions 1-4, are usually emphatic, and the words after the sentence boundary tend to belong syntactically to the following even line:

E3 V	Eskál IV, 3:7-8	víst hyggjum þat / (viggja ǁ valdr)
XE3	GSúrs 34:3-4	stór fingum ben / (brynju ǁ báðar hendr með vendi)
	Vell 15:7-8	þeim stýra goð / (geira ǁ garðs Hlórriði farði)
E4 V	Eg lv 10:7-8	helnauð es þat / (hylja ǁ harm)
	Húsdr 6:3-4	ramt mein vas þat / (reyni ǁ reyrar leggs við eyra).

Sectional clauses of Type A Odd are less distinct, and, depending on the pattern and the placement of the verb (positions 1, 1-2, or 5-6), the parenthetic clause can be either line initial or line final, and the words before or after the parenthetic clause belong to a sentence that is continued in the next line, as the following examples show:

A3^3	VGl 1:3-4	*þverr* við glaum / (enn grœni ǁ garðr)
A3^4	Hfr V, 1:7-8	*stœrik* brag / (fyr búri ǁ búrhundr gamall stúri)
A1^2	Þmáhl 6:3-4	hrafn *naut* hræva / (Gefnar ǁ hjaldrskýja mik frýju)
A2^3	Þjóð IV, 2:7-8	*vesið* með oss / (unz verði ǁ veðr)
A1^2	Eg lv 11:7-8	(helt) / né hafnar *sultu* ǁ (Hringr á vápnaþingi)
A1^3	GSúrs 8:3-4	(Gauts) / þess's geig of *veittak* ǁ (gunnbliks þáamiklu)
A2^5	Haustl 8:7-8	(málunaut) / hvats *mátti* ǁ (miðjungs friðar biðja).

Most of the sectional clauses in odd lines occur in *lausavísur*, and they clearly perform the same function as odd one-line clauses, that is, they provide alliteration for the following even line and, in addition, accommodate suspended and disrupted sentence elements on the other side of the sentence boundary.

There is good reason for the scarcity of odd sectional clauses. The main function of the third line in the *helmingr* was to introduce new clauses that could be continued into the following even line, thus furnishing the necessary alliteration

and the rhyme for the semantically important elements in the cadence of line 4 (see below). Sectional clauses with a hard sentence boundary after position 4 (Type E) were poorly suited for that function, and sectional clauses in line-final position (Type A) in which the sentence boundary coincided with the metrical caesura of course precluded direct connection between the odd line and the following even line. Another important function of the third line, especially in panegyrics, was to facilitate the placement of longer suspended nominal elements from earlier lines and at the same time to create a bridge between the content of the previous lines and the end of the *helmingr*. As the following examples show, the pattern best suited to fulfill that requirement is Type A2[5], with a trisyllabic compound or similar syntactic unit in positions 1-3 and a proclitic introductory element in position 4:

Rdr 4:3-4	(hræva dǫgg) / þars hǫggnar ‖ hendr sem fœtr of kenndusk
Haustl 8:3-4	(sveita nagr) / svát slitna ‖ sundr ulfs faðir mundi
Gráf 7:3-4	(þróttar orð) / es þorði ‖ þjóðum vǫll at rjóða
Hfr III, 4:3-4	(brodda flaug) / áðr bauga ‖ brjótendr skyti spjótum
Vell 18:3-4	(Gætinjǫrðr) / sás gerði ‖ (geirbríkar) / frið slíkan.

In even lines, sectional clauses were much more common than in odd lines and, as we have seen, some patterns (E3-4 Verbal, A[3]) were used to achieve certain stylistic effects (*tilsagt, hjástælt*). The main task of even lines was to continue or conclude a sentence begun in an earlier line, and there was usually no direct syntactic connection between the second line and the following odd line.[10] A few *helmingar* with sectional clauses in line 2 illustrate that point:

Eg lv 20:5-8	Gunnhildi ák gjalda
	(greypts hennar skap) / þenna
	(ungr gatk ok læ launat)
	landrekstr / (bili grandat).
Gldr 7:1-4	ríks / (þreifsk reiddra øxa
	rymr) / (knáttu spjǫr glymja)
	svartskyggð bitu seggi
	sverð þjóðkonungs ferðar.

Whereas in odd lines the words adjacent to the sectional clauses belonged syntactically to the following even line and were usually linked to that line by means of alliteration, in even lines those words were constituents of a sentence that occupied the previous odd line, and those words only carried alliteration in initial position (e.g., in *hjástælt*). In even lines sectional clauses in line-final position (*hjástælt*) predominate, and in odd lines such clauses tend to be line-initial. This

distribution cannot be fortuitous, and, as we shall see below, alliteration across the metrical caesura was the most important device by which the poets emphasized syntactic cohesion.

Scholars have often speculated whether lines containing parenthetic clauses could have been set off from the rest of the stanza by means of a special intonation or pitch (Reinskou 1924:71; Genzmer 1930:155; de Vries 1941:85; Jón Helgason 1953:105; Hollander 1965:639). As we have seen, parenthetic clauses in lines of Type E (and occasionally A2k) are characterized by emphatic content, and they could occur in the proximity of vocatives, as in the following examples:[11]

GSúrs 33:7-8	líkn reynum svá / *lauka* (*Vár*)
Eg I, 1:7-8	hér sverjum þess *hyrjar* ‖ *hrannbrjótr*
Eskál IV, 3:7-8	víst hyggjum þat / *viggja* ‖ *valdr*.

There are other indications as well that Type E must have been well suited for rhetoric emphasis. Eyvindr's *lausavísa* 10, for example, in which he vehemently declines to join forces with King Haraldr Eiríksson, contains three such emphatic E-lines (10:1 *einn dróttin hefk áttan*, 10:2 *jǫfurr dýrr an þik fyrra*, 10:6 *tveim skjǫldum lékk aldri*), and Gísli's poetry, which abounds in forms of address and emphatic statements, is characterized by a high number of Type E Verbal-lines. In Gísli's *lausavísa* 16, most of the dream woman's admonitions are contained in E-lines, some of which are highly unorthodox:

GSúrs 16	vald eigi þú vígi	(E3 V)
	(ves ótyrrinn) / fyrri	(D2)
	(morðs við Mœtinjǫrðu)	(A1^2)
	(mér heitið því) / (sleitu);	(E3 V);
	baugskyndir hjálp blindum /	(E3)
	Baldr hygg at því skjaldar /	(E4 V)
	illt kveða háð / (ok hǫltum)	(A3^3)
	handlausum tý / (granda)	(E3).

Because of their content, it is quite likely that parenthetic clauses in lines of Type E Verbal did indeed receive special emphasis during recitation, but we cannot therefore assume that all parenthetic clauses were characterized by a special intonation, and it is difficult to believe that stereotyped and semantically insignificant fillers were set off in a similar way.

As the discussion above has indicated, parenthetic clauses occur in fixed positions in *dróttkvætt* stanzas. In odd lines they are contained in line 3 and in even lines in lines 2 or 4. The main function of parenthetic clauses was to fill empty slots in the lines and to eke out the necessary rhymes and alliteration to accommodate the elements of the main clauses in the *helmingr*. Because the third

line usually fulfilled tasks that were incompatible with the structure of sectional clauses, such asides are not very common in odd lines. In even lines there were no such restrictions, and certain types of sectional clauses took on stylistic functions that the skalds could use for their own artistic ends (*hjástælt*, *tilsagt*). Parenthetic clauses are less common in encomiastic poetry than in *lausavísur*, and the substance of such clauses is quite different in the two genres (objective versus subjective).

Eddic poetry contains few parenthetic clauses. Because the sentence boundaries in *fornyrðislag* tend to coincide with the metrical caesura, there are no sectional clauses, and the parenthetic asides occupy the full half-line (lines 2 or 3). Consider the following examples:

Vsp 66:5-8	berr sér í fiǫðrom - flýgr vǫll yfir - Níðhǫggr, nái - nú mun hon søcqvaz.
Br 14:5-8	'Hvetið mic eða letið mic - harmr er unninn -, sorg at segia eða svá láta!'.
Sg 34:1-4	Segia mun ec þér, Gunnarr, - siálfr veiztu gorla - hvé ér yðr snemma til saca réðot.
Vsp 20:5-8	Urð héto eina, aðra Verðandi - scáro á scíði -, Sculd ina þriðio.
HH I, 17:1-4	Enn af hesti Hǫgna dóttir - líddi randa rym - ræsi sagði.
Od 14:1-4	'Var ec up alin í iǫfra sal - flestr fagnaði - at fira ráði'.

There can be no doubt that the one-line insertions in eddic *fornyrðislag* fulfill the same function as in skaldic *dróttkvætt*, namely, to provide the necessary alliteration for the sentence-introductory first line or the sentence-concluding fourth line. In *fornyrðislag* stanzas, which are characterized by sequences of sentences rather than by framing and interlace (see D. Edwards 1983:128), however, metrical accommodation is usually achieved by other means, such as epic repetition, variation, suspended nominal sentence elements in line 3, and an abundance of place names and epithets (usually Type C-lines) in line 4, as the following examples show:

HH I, 8:1-8	Gaf hann Helga nafn
	oc Hringstaði
	Sólfioll, Snæfioll
	oc Sigarsvollo,
	Hringstoð, Hátún
	oc Himinvanga,
	blóðorm búinn,
	brœðr Sinfiotla.
Vsp 37:1-4	Stóð fyr norðan
	á Niðavollom,
	salr ór gulli
	Sindra ættar.
Hlr 8:1-4	Þá lét ec gamlan
	á Goðþióðo
	Hiálm-Gunnar næst
	heliar ganga.
HH I, 31:1-8	Svát þar um aptan
	í Unavágom
	flaust fagrbúin
	flióta knátto;
	enn þeir siálfir
	frá Svarinshaugi
	með hermðar hug
	her konnoðo.

Sometimes a stanza contains all these devices, including one-line parenthetic clauses:

HHj 6:1-6   'Síð mundu, Helgi,
             hringom ráða,
             rícr rógapaldr,
             né Rǫðulsvǫllom
             - ǫrn gól árla -,
             ef þú æ þegir.'

HH II, 25:1-8   'Muna þér Sigrún
                 frá Sefafiǫllom,
                 Hǫðbroddr konungr,
                 hníga at armi;
                 liðin er ævi
                 - opt náir hrævi
                 gránstóð gríðar -
                 Granmars sona.'

In these two stanzas, the main content is conveyed in lines 1-2+6 (*síð mundu, Helgi, hringom ráða, ef þú æ þegir*) and lines 1 and 4 (5 and 8; *muna þér Sigrún hníga at armi, liðin er ævi Granmars sona*), whereas the vocatives (*rícr rógapaldr, Hǫðbroddr konungr*), place names (*Rǫðulsvellir, Sefafiǫll*), and parenthetic clauses (*ǫrn gól árla, opt náir hrævi gránstóð gríðar*) provide the necessary alliterating staves. In *dróttkvætt helmingar* that contain few appositives and variations, the suspended nominal elements (parts of *kenningar*, attributive adjectives, vocatives), fulfill a similar function (see Kuhn 1983:236-37).

Endings

The most common types of fillers in the last line of the *helmingr* are Types D2, E3-4, and A2k (see Kuhn 1983:197). These patterns contain nominal compounds or similar syntactic units that were well suited to accommodate suspended nominal attributives and sentence elements. As the following examples show, sentence boundaries in line 4 could fall after positions 1 (D2, E3 Verbal, E4 Verbal, and A^{2-3}), 2 (E4, E4 Verbal, A2k, and $A^{1, 4}$), 3 (E3 and A^{3-5}), and 4 (D1, D2, E3, E3 Verbal, E4, E4 Verbal, and A2k):

D2	Gldr 4:7-8	endisk rauðra randa ‖ rǫdd / (dynskotum kvǫddusk)
E3 V	VGl 7:3-4	esat at manna máli ‖ morð / (váru þau forðum)
E4 V	Korm lv 19:3-4	líknsýnir mér lúka ‖ ljós / (þér at ver kjósa)
A^2	Haustl 3:7-8	vasa Hœnis vinr hánum ‖ hollr / (af fornum þolli)
A^3	Korm I, 5:3-4	Haptsœnis geldk hánum ‖ heið / (sitr Þórr í reiðu)
E4	Vell 31:7-8	allt vann gramr of gengit ‖ Gautland / (frá sjá randir)

E4 V	Hfr V, 2:3-4	ótti / (eingadóttur ‖ Ávalds) / es þat skaldi
A2k	Vell 11:3-4	þrimlundr of jók Þundi ‖ þegns gnótt / (méilregni)
A1	GSúrs 17:3-4	mér gengr Sjǫfn í svefna ‖ sauma / (mínir draumar)
A4	Vígf II, 1:3-4	þryngr at Viðris veðri ‖ vandar / (góðr fyr hǫndum)
E3	Bbreiðv 3:7-8	enn emk gjarn til Gunnar ‖ gjalfrelda / (mér sjǫlfum)
A3	Hfr V, 27:7-8	áðr vask ungu fljóði ‖ (út of borð) / at sútum
A4	Korm lv 59:7-8	(lunds) / komk lítlu sprundi ‖ (lǫngum minnzk) / ór ǫngum
A5	Haustl 2:7-8	vasa Byrgitýr bjarga ‖ bleyði vændr / (á seyði)
D1	Eg lv 17:7-8	vér deildum fjǫl foldar ‖ foldværingja / (goldin)
D2	Korm lv 7:7-8	dýr verðr Fægifreyja ‖ (fimm hundraða) / snimma
A2k	Vell 34:3-4	hinns fór í gný Gunnar ‖ (gunndjarfr Búi) / sunnan
E3	Korm lv 39:3-4	stǫndumk Ilmr fyr yndi ‖ (ógǫrva þat) / sǫrva
E3 V	TE 5:7-8	Haralds hefk skarð í skildi ‖ (skala ugga þat) / hǫggvit
E4	Þmáhl 8:3-4	kunnfáka hné kennir ‖ (klámorð af mér) / borða
E4 V	Hfr III, 22:7-8	menn geta máli sǫnnu ‖ (mjǫks verr an svá) / ferri.

If line 4 contains a sentence boundary, the clause arrangement in the preceding line is relatively simple. In 79 percent of the *helmingar*, a new sentence is introduced in line 3, and that sentence is extended into line 4 to include the words before the sentence boundary (74 percent) or the words after the sentence boundary (23 percent). Our discussions of types of syntactic fillers in Chapters 4-6 showed that sentence boundaries after position 4 are relatively rare, and such breaks are usually marked syntactically to avoid confusion; that is, the lexico-grammatical fillers or the case markings in positions 4 and 5-6 indicate the syntactic disruption. Furthermore, as the examples above show, in a line with a sentence boundary after position 4, the word in the cadence is more prone to belong to the previous line than if the sentence boundary falls after position 1, 2, or 3. Thus the skalds appear to have avoided sentence completion in the cadence, unless the word in positions 5-6 belonged syntactically to the previous odd line.[12]

A little more than 20 percent of the *helmingar* with sentence boundaries in line 4 do not follow the clause arrangement above, that is, no new clause is introduced in line 3. In most of these *helmingar*, however, either the words before or after the sentence boundary belong to the clause in line 3, as in the following examples:

Eil I, 1:3-4	á sefreinu Sónar ‖ sáð / (vingjǫfum ráða)
Rdr 13:7-8	fyr vinjeyjar víðri ‖ vallrauf / (fjogur haufuð)
Þjsk I, 1:3-4	fremra jarl und ferli ‖ (Folkránar) / þér mána
GSúrs 19:7-8	brynju hatrs ens bitra ‖ beiðendr / (ef nú reiðumk)
Vell 21:3-4	hǫlða morðs at halda ‖ (herr fell of gram) / velli
Korm I, 7:3-4	ýs bifvangi Yngva ‖ ungr / (fór Hroptr með Gungni)
Korm lv 25:7-8	sǫngvarðaða sverða ‖ sennu / (mér at kenna).

Almost 60 percent of these *helmingar* are from panegyrics, which is not at all surprising, because the premeditated panegyrics are characterized by longer and more complex nominal circumlocutions than the *lausavísur* (see Reichardt 1928:72). Furthermore, the one-clause pattern and the interlace pattern are more common in panegyrics than in *lausavísur*, which prefer the sequence pattern (see D. Edwards 1983:145). This structural difference between encomiastic poems and *lausavísur* must be related to their respective content matter, as well as to the care with which they were composed. Most panegyrics must have been premeditated and rehearsed in advance and, unlike the *lausavísur* in the sagas, which addressed themselves to and were elucidated by the actions described in the surrounding prose, panegyrics demanded the undivided attention of an audience that would have taken time to ponder and appreciate their structural complexity.

Most of the *lausavísur* in which line 3 is not sentence introductory belong to the poetry of Egill, Kormákr, and Gísli, and, because many of these *helmingar* also contain other structural peculiarities, it may be useful at this point to examine them closer. Consider the following couplets:[13]

Eg lv 10:7-8	(helnauð es þat) / hylja ‖ harm / ágætum barma
Eg lv 14:3-4	haukaklifs / (at hefja) ‖ Hlín / (þvergnípur mínar)
Eg lv 29:3-4	við bifteini / (bœnar) ‖ brynju / (rétt at synja)
Eg lv 36:3-4	horna sund at hendi ‖ (hvert full) / bragar Ulli
Eg lv 36:7-8	hrosta tjǫrn í horni ‖ (horns) / til dags at morni;
Korm lv 1:3-4	réttumk risti / (snótar ‖ ramma ást) / fyr skǫmmu
Korm lv 40:3-4	þat séum reið at ráði ‖ (rík) / (þveim megin bríkar)
Korm lv 52:4	með blót roðin / (beiði ‖ benhlunns) / (sús mér unni);
GSúrs 3:3-4	slíks af svefni vǫkðum ‖ sárteina / (Vésteini)
GSúrs 8:3-4	Gauts / (þess's geig of veittak) ‖ gunnbliks / þáamiklu
GSúrs 14:7-8	veðrs Skjǫldunga valdi ‖ vetr / (nús skamt til betra)
GSúrs 15:3-4	árr / (nema allgótt heyrir) ‖ Iðja galdrs / at skǫldum
GSúrs 15:7-8	randar logs ens reynda ‖ runnr / (an illt at kunna)
GSúrs 16:3-4	morðs við Mœtinjǫrðu ‖ (mér heitið því) / sleitu.

Two of Egill's *lausavísur* bear all the marks of premeditated composition. *Lausavísa* 14 has an intricate onomastic pun on the name of Egills' beloved, Ásgerðr (*Bergóneris foldar faldr* 'the head dress [*gerð*-] of Bergónerir's land [*áss*]'), and *lausavísa* 10, in which Egill laments his dead brother, Þórólfr, contains complex intercalations as well as unconventional syntactic fillers which led Kuhn to pronounce the stanza the work of a later interpolator (Kuhn 1983:262). However, both stanzas contain features that were characteristic of Egill's style (Type E3 Odd with sentence boundaries after position 4), and it is possible that the irregularities in *lausavísa* 10 resulted from Egill's conscious attempt to break with the current tradition. Egill's *lausavísa* 29 and Kormákr's *lausavísa* 52 both have C-

lines with sentence boundaries after position 4. Such sentence boundaries are otherwise not attested in ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt*, and Kormákr's stanza contains other violations as well, such as a lack of internal rhyme, an even C-line (52:2 *es it heim komið báðir*) that is a verbatim echo of an eddic *fornyrðislag* line (Grp 43:6 *er it heim komit*), the pronoun *hann* in an x-position (52:7 *hefr hann sveinn enn svarti*), which otherwise only occurs in eddic poetry (e.g., Sdr 5:5 *fullr er hann lióða*), and the encliticized definite article (52:8 *sonr Qgmundar skaldit*). Finnur Jónsson questioned the authenticity of Egill's stanza (*Skj* IA: 56; see also Poole 1991:177), and it is not unlikely that both stanzas are from later than the tenth century.

Egill's *lausavísa* 36 shows a verbal and syntactic interplay that forces the assumption that it was premeditated. The stanza consists of two variant *helmingar*; in which the second not only repeats the clause arrangement and syntactic fillers of the first (see Reichardt 1928:136), but it also elaborates on a rhyme scheme that evolves around the word *horn*. Consider the following *helmingar*:

Eg lv 36   drekkum ór / (þótt Ekkils
            eykríðr beri tíðum
            horna sund at hendi)
            hvert full / (bragar Ulli);
            leifik vætr / (þótt Laufa
            leikstœrir mér fœri
            hrosta tjǫrn í horni)
            horns / (til dags at morni).

Of the remaining two stanzas from Kormákr's *lausavísur* (1 and 40), the content matter and the verbal tenses of the first have led scholars to believe that it was composed after the event described in the stanza took place (see von See, 1977:62-63) and that stanza, along with the subsequent nine, was part of a separate poem about Steingerðr, Kormákr's romantic interest. The second stanza (lv 40), which nicely paraphrases stanza 68 of the short lay of Sigurðr,[14] contains a highly irregular odd D2-line (40:7 *dýr skǫfnunga drafnar*), and, despite perspicatious attempts to unravel its content (notably by Frank 1970), the syntax is all wrong (cf. Chap. 5, pp. 112-13). The first *helmingr* is easier to interpret, although the sentence pattern is very complex (abcba), and the possibility that it could have been composed extemporaneously is difficult to believe.

A cluster of *lausavísur* from *Gísla saga* displays a similar structure at the end of the *helmingar* (lv 14, 15, 16). All these stanzas are part of his sequence of "dream poems," and they are characterized by direct speech from a third person (the dream woman). That frame of reference is unusual in skaldic poetry, in which indirect speech can be reported by the skald (e.g., Hfr III, 2:1-2 *geta skal máls þess's mæla // menn* 'I shall recount what men say,' etc.), but direct speech, as a rule, is

restricted to the skald himself. Although all these stanzas show signs of having been carefully thought out, they also contain patterns that characterize Gísli's other poems, namely, a short independent clause at the end of the *helmingr* (see Reichardt 1928:238-39). Consider the following lines:

GSúrs 14:8	vetr / (nús skamt til betra)
GSúrs 15:8	runnr / (an illt at kunna)
GSúrs 2:4	gladdr / (en vargar saddir)
GSúrs 6:2	brast / (kannkat þat lasta)
GSúrs 19:4	orðfátt / (es munk láta)
GSúrs 19:8	beiðendr / (ef nú reiðumk)
GSúrs 20:8	snauð / (þats mér verðr auðit)
GSúrs 32:8	†Benlofn / (es ek sofna).

The subject matter of Gísli's *lausavísa* 16, which is part of the dream sequence with direct speech, is difficult to reconcile with a tenth-century pagan environment.[15] However, as indicated above, that stanza also shares features that are characteristic of the poems in *Gísla saga*, and, as a whole, the poems in that saga are structurally so close that it is difficult to believe that they were not composed by one person. Whether that poet was the tenth-century skald Gísli Súrsson is of course open to debate (see Kuhn 1983:290-91).[16]

The remaining two couplets from Gísli's *lausavísur* that do not follow the sequence pattern are two stanzas that deal with the death of Gísli's foster brother, Vésteinn, at the hands of Þorgrímr, Gísli's brother-in-law (lv 3), and Gísli's subsequent confession of his own retaliatory slaying of Þorgrímr (lv 8). The latter stanza contains an elaborate onomastic pun on the name Þorgrímr (*tálgríms vinar fálu* 'Grímr of the destroyer of the witch's companion [Þórr],' cf. Egill's lv 14, above), and the accompanying prose leaves no doubt that the verbal subtleties of this stanza were not understood during the first recitation: according to the saga, Gísli's sister, Þórdís, memorized it and went home to ponder its content (*Gísl* 29-30; cf. Chap. 1, p. 24).

We have seen then, that most of the *lausavísur* that show structural affinities with panegyrics are likely to have been premeditated (e.g., Eg lv 14, GSúrs 8) and that some of them may have been parts of longer poems (e.g., Kormákr's Steingerðr stanzas and Gísli's dream stanzas).[17] Other stanzas contain violations of the rules of strict *dróttkvætt* as well as complex clause arrangements, and it is not unlikely that these stanzas could have been the products of later interpolators (e.g., Eg lv 29, Korm lv 52). Echoes from eddic lays (notably from the Sigurðr cycle) may lead to the suspicion that some *lausavísur* were conscious reworkings of alliterative stanzas so as to evoke connections between the subject matter in the skaldic poems and their heroic models.[18] There is evidence that the syntactically more intricate *lausavísur* were not completely understood by the audience during

the first recital, but it is difficult to say whether the alleged obscurity of Gísli's *lausavísa* was caused by the double-edged *kenning* or by its clausal complexity.

As we have seen, the main function of the third line in *dróttkvætt* half-stanzas was to provide a connection between lines 3 and 4. Such a connection could be achieved by the onset of a new clause that occupied the whole or parts of line 3 and parts of line 4 or by the extension into line 4 of elements that belonged syntactically to the sentence in line 3 (cf. the encomiastic poems and the *lausavísur* discussed above). The connections between the two last lines in the *helmingr* proceed according to the following stereotyped patterns:

(1) direct connection with enjambment:

Hallbj 1:7-8	snertumk harmr of hjarta ‖ hrót / (aldrigi bótir)
Glúmr lv 1:7-8	roðin frák rauðra benja ‖ reyr / (Hákonar dreyra)
Eyv lv 13:7-8	ítr / þærs upp of róta ‖ unnsvín / (vinum mínum)
Þjóð IV, 2:7-8	vesið með oss / unz verði ‖ veðr / (nús brim fyr Jaðri)
Hfr III, 21:7-8	(heilalíkn) / (ef) / hauka ‖ háklifs / (jǫfurr lifði);

(2) indirect connection with vertical placement:

Vell 18:3-4	Gætinjǫrðr / (sás gerði) ‖ geirbríkar / (frið slíkan)
Eg lv 13:7-8	sás til ýgr / (af augum) ‖ armsíma / (mér grímu)
Haustl 10:7-8	váru heldr / (ok hárar) ‖ hamljót regin / (gamlar)
Eg lv 10:3-4	þreklundaðr fell / (Þundar) ‖ Þórólfr/(í gný stórum)
GSúrs 14:3-4	mildr / (hvé margir eldar) ‖ malmrunnr / (í sal brunnu);

(3) indirect connection with insertion:

Vell 12:7-8	þat fær þjóðar snytri ‖ (þrír jarlssynir) / tírar
Þjsk I, 1:3-4	fremra jarl und ferli ‖ (Folkránar) / þér mána
HolmgB 1:3-4	þoll má þann of kalla ‖ (þríar merkr) / hugum sterkjan
Eg lv 16:7-8	þigg Auða konr eiða ‖ (eiðscert es þat) / greiða
Gldr 7:7-8	hár vas sǫngr of svírum ‖ (sigr) / flugbeiddra vigra.

The first pattern, which also can accommodate sectional parenthetic clauses in final position, is by far the most common, whereas the pattern with vertical placement is mostly restricted to panegyric poems and Egill's *lausavísur*. The third pattern can accommodate parenthetic clauses in initial position and is the only pattern in which the sentence parts in lines 3 and 4 are not connected by alliteration.

These arrangements are not restricted to the second couplet of the *helmingar*, and they also occur in the first two lines. Around 60 percent of all lines with a sentence boundary in the second line have direct connection with enjambment, 15

percent have indirect connection with vertical placement, 20 percent have indirect connection with insertion, and only 5 percent have no syntactic connection between the first and the second line. Consider the following examples:

(1) direct connection with enjambment:

Eg lv 43:5-6	mér brásk minnar systur ‖ mǫgr / (hétumk þá fǫgru)
Korm lv 60:1-2	hirðat handar girðis ‖ Hlín / (sof hjá ver þínum)
Hgóði 1:1-2	vel launa mér mínir ‖ menn / (œxlum styr þenna)
Rdr 15:1-2	hamri fórsk í hœgri ‖ hǫnd / (þás allra landa)
Gráf 3:5-6	slíðrtungur lét syngva ‖ sverðleiks reginn / (ferðir);

(2) direct connection with vertical placement:

Korm lv 4:1-2	hófat lind / (né leyndak) ‖ líðs hyrjar / (því stríði)
Vell 13:5-6	varðat Freyr / (sás fœri) ‖ folkskíðs / (né mun síðan)
Þmáhl 5:1-2	sóttu heim / (þeirs hættu) ‖ Hjǫrnirðir mik / (fjǫrvi)
Haustl 15:1-2	knáttu ǫll / (en Ullar) ‖ endilág / (fyr mági)
HolmgB 8:5-6	svá fara ráð / (en reiðask) ‖ róglinns / (sumir minna);

(3) indirect connection with insertion:

Eg lv 20:5-6	Gunnhildi ák gjalda ‖ (greypts hennar skap) / þenna
Vell 20:1-2	hóf und hyrjar kneyfi ‖ (hraut unda fjǫl) / Þundar
HolmgB 6:5-6	nú vilja mik mínir ‖ (minnst dyljum þess) / hylja
Haustl 17:1-2	brátt fló bjarga gæti ‖ (bǫnd ollu því) / randa
Vell 16:1-2	ok herþarfir hverfa ‖ (Hlakkar móts) / til blóta.

If the two lines of the first couplet are connected by enjambment or vertical placement, the words in initial position, line 2, are often part of the suspended subject or a vocative (base word, genitival qualifier, adjectival attributive), and they frequently form syntactic units with an alliterating nomen in the preceding odd line, thus straddling the metrical caesura (*minnar systur // mǫgr, mínir // menn, handar girðis // Hlín, lind // líðs hyrjar, Freyr // folkskíðs, ǫll // endilág [ginnunga vé], ráð // róglinns*). The number of nominal phrases whose elements are linked by alliteration is too high to be fortuitous, and the devices of enjambment, vertical placement, and the cohesive force of alliteration are explored in more detail in the next section.

To sum up: most lines have clearly defined functions in the clause arrrangement in the *helmingr*. Line 1 is always sentence introductory and, depending on the filler of position 1, such lines can introduce bound clauses (Types B, C, $A1^2$, and $A3^{2-3}$) or independent clauses (Types E, A2k, $A1^{1-4}$, $A2^{1,\ 3-4}$, and $A3^{1-4}$). The main

function of the second line is to accommodate elements from line 1, often by utilizing such devices as enjambment and vertical placement. Line 3 either introduces a new clause that provides the necessary alliteration (and rhyme) for the concluding statement in line 4, or it contains continuing patterns (especially Types D1-2, A1[1], and A2[5]) with suspended nominal elements from an earlier line (usually line 1). In both cases, enjambment, vertical placement, and indirect connection with insertion are extremely common, and, while syntactic cohesion between lines 2 and 3 is rare, there is usually strong cohesion between the last two lines of the *helmingr*. The fourth line concludes the half-stanza and provides the final resolution of tensions created by earlier syntactic disruptions. In most cases this completion contains syntactically necessary elements (Mohr 1933:5-7; D. Edwards 1983:174-75), and it is clear that Types D2, E3-4, A2k and A[2, 5], with nominal elements in inititial position and sentence boundaries after position 1, 2, or 3, were eminently suited to furnish the necessary rhyme to accommodate such syntactic completions. The following examples serve to demonstrate that point:

D2	Rdr 13:3-4	svát af rennirauknum ‖ rauk / (Danmarkar auka)
	Eg lv 28:3-4	skulum banna mjǫk manni ‖ mey / (ørlygi at heyja)
E3	Korm lv 35:3-4	várat virðar stœri ‖ vellauðigr / (mér dauða)
	Hfr III, 23:3-4	ferk með lýða líði ‖ landherðar / (skǫp verða)
E4	Rdr 12:3-4	Ræs gǫfumk reiðar mána ‖ Ragnarr / (ok fjǫl sagna)
	Jór 2:3-4	sýnisk svartleitr reyni ‖ sjá bragr / (ens hárfagra)
A[2]	Haustl 3:7-8	vasa Hœnis vinr hánum ‖ hollr / (af fornum þolli)
	Eg lv 22:7-8	stendr af styrjar skyndi ‖ starf / (á einum karfa)
A[5]	Haustl 2:7-8	vasa Byrgitýr bjarga ‖ bleyði vændr / (á seyði)
	Korm lv 45:7-8	þós Mengunnar manni ‖ meira vant / (ór leiri).

Thus beginnings and endings were easy to identify, and the syntax was facilitated by the placement of finite verbs and subjects. Suspended elements occur in predictable positions and are often linked by alliteration (enjambment, vertical placement). The parenthetic clauses that fulfill certain compositional purposes could not have contributed to syntactic obscurity. They occupy fixed positions in specific patterns and, while not distracting attention from the main message of the stanza, they must have served to space the narrative and allow the audience to focus on the clusters of semantically pregnant elements.

The clause arrangement in eddic *fornyrðislag* stanzas is much simpler than that of *dróttkvætt* stanzas. In even lines, syntactic boundaries tend to coincide with the metrical caesura, and, although embedded one-line clauses occur with some frequency (Reichardt's frame pattern), the eddic sentences are usually sequential. In eddic poetry, epic repetition and suspended nominal sentence elements in line 3 appear to have fulfilled a function similiar to the parenthetic clauses in skaldic poetry. The *dróttkvætt* style is not characterized by appositives, but suspended

nominal elements apparently function similarly in the two poetic traditions. Compare the following eddic and skaldic versions of Þórr's encounter with the World Serpent:

Hym 22	egndi á ǫngul
	(sá er ǫldom bergr)
	orms einbani
	uxa hǫfði;
	gein við ǫngli
	(sú er goð fiá)
	umbgiǫrð neðan
	allra landa.
Hym 23	dró diarfliga
	dáðraccr Þórr
	orm eitrfá[a]n
	upp at borði;
	hamri kníði
	háfiall scarar
	ofliótt, ofan
	úlfs hnitbróður.
Rdr 16	vaðr lá Viðris arfa
	vilgi slakr / (es rakðisk)
	á Eynæfis ǫndri
	(Jǫrmungandr at sandi).
Rdr 17	ok borðróins barða
	brautar þvengr enn ljóti
	á haussprengi Hrungnis
	harðgeðr neðan starði.
Rdr 15	hamri fórsk í hœgri
	hǫnd / (þás allra landa)
	œgir ǫflugbarða
	(endiseiðs of kenndi).

In both poems, the third line of the half-stanzas tends to contain suspended nominal elements, and new clauses are introduced in the second line. Enjambment is prominent in both poems, and the stanzas from "Hymisqviða" also have vertical placement with alliteration (*umbgiǫrð neðan // allra landa*). Just as in the eddic poem, the clause arrangement in the *helmingar* from "Ragnarsdrápa" is

uncomplicated (Reichardt's one-clause pattern and frame pattern), and Bragi's half-stanzas contain none of the sectional parenthetic clauses and interlace patterns of later poetry. Consider the following half-stanzas with the same subject matter by Ulfr Uggason, Eysteinn Valdason, and Gamli gnævaðarskald:

Húsdr 6:1-4	fullqflugr lét fellir
	Fjallgauts hnefa skjalla
	(ramt mein vas þat) / reyni
	reyrar leggs við eyra.
EVald 2	leit á brattrar brautar
	baug hvassligum augum
	(œstisk áðr at flausti
	qggs búð) / faðir Þrúðar.
EVald 3	svá brá viðr / (at sýjur)
	seiðr / (renndu framm breiðar)
	jarðar / (út at borði
	Ulls mágs hnefar skullu).
Gamli 1	þás gramr / (hinns svik samðit)
	snart Bilskírnis / (hjarta)
	grundar fisk með grandi
	gljúfrskeljungs nam rjúfa.

According to Reichardt (1928:215-19), the clause arrangements of "Ragnarsdrápa" are characterized by extreme simplicity, and from his statistics it emerges that Bragi, like the eddic poets, showed a marked preference for the one-clause pattern and sequence pattern (77 percent). Based on his observations of the clause arrangement in "Ragnarsdrápa," Reichardt concluded, therefore, that it is indeed the oldest extant poem in *dróttkvætt* meter. He wrote (Reichardt 1928:215):[19]

> Die Betrachtung des Satzbaus aller Skalden der beiden ältesten Jahrhunderte macht es vielmehr sehr wahrscheinlich, daß wir es in Bragis Strophen mit einer frühen Stufe einer ständig fortschreitenden Entwicklung zu tun haben, die im 10. Jahrhundert kulminiert und um die Wende zum 11. Jahrhundert wieder absteigt.

A similar conclusion, although based on other criteria, was reached by Kuhn (1983:279). It seems, then, that the complex intercalations of later *dróttkvætt* stanzas, and of encomiastic poems in particular, resulted from an indigenous development within the *dróttkvætt* tradition, and that the earliest skaldic poetry

contained clause arrangements similar to those of eddic *fornyrðislag* (i.e., Reichardt's one-clause pattern, sequence pattern, and occasionally the frame pattern).

Enjambment, Vertical Placement, and the Role of Alliteration

Alliteration was one of the most important devices by which the skalds could emphasize the cohesion between disrupted syntactic elements (vertical placement) or elements that were separated by the metrical caesura (enjambment). Certain statements in the Old Norse metrical and grammatical treatises show that the poets, as late as the thirteenth century, were certainly aware of the power of alliteration (Gade 1990:51-53). In his "Háttatal," Snorri Sturluson claims that the placement of the alliterating staves distinguishes all poetic speech ("stafasetníng greinir mál allt"; *SnE* I:594), and, in the "Third Grammatical Treatise," Snorri's nephew, Óláfr Þórðarson, writes (*SnE* II:148-50):

> PAROMEON er þat, er mörg orð hafa einn upphafsstaf. ... Þessi figúra er mjök höfð í málsnildar list, er RETORIKA heitir, ok er hon upphaf til þeirrar kveðendi, er saman heldr norrænum kveðskap, sem naglar skipi, er smiðr gjörir, ok ferr sundrlaust ella borð frá borði; svâ heldr ok þessi figúra saman kveðendi í skáldskap, með stöfum þeim er stuðlar heita ok höfuðstafir.

> (*Paromœon* is to have many words beginning with the same letter. ... This figure of speech is highly esteemed in the art of oratory called *rhetorica*, and it is the foundation of that scheme of alliteration that holds together Norse poetry as the nails, which the smith makes, hold together the ship to prevent the planks from falling apart. Thus this figure also holds together the poetic speech with those letters that are called props and main staves.)

These observations nicely describe the cohesive power of alliteration in enjambment and vertical placement: the main stave determined the syntax (i.e., whether or not the word in initial position in the even line was a syntactic part of the previous line, as in *hjástælt*), and the alliterating staves soldered the elements that belonged together syntactically.

From our earlier discussions in Chapters 4-6, we can see that, in odd lines, the placement of the alliterating staves to a great extent determined the syntactic fillers. Because the sequence n+ń was prohibited, the syntactic configurations in odd lines differed from those of even lines, and the restrictions imposed by alliteration also account for the lack of similarity in the fillers of odd *dróttkvætt* lines with alliteration in position 5 and *fornyrðislag* lines of Types E, D, A2k, and A2. A look at the lines with enjambment involving two elements of a nominal phrase reveals

that similar restrictions of alliteration apply across the metrical caesura. Because the word in initial position in the even line always alliterated, enjambment was only possible if alliteration fell on both elements (ń+ń), that is, in odd patterns with alliteration in position 5 or in position 3 if the words in positions 3-6 formed a syntactic unit (Types A1[1-2]). Consider the following examples:

E3	Sindr 4:1-2	skattgilda vann *skyldir* ‖ *skautjalfaðar* Gauta
E3 V	Korm lv 64:5-6	bera knáttu þó *breiðan* ‖ *blóðvǫnd* hjarar Þundar
EX3	Eskál IV, 2:5-6	drepr eigi *sá sveigir* ‖ *sárlinns* / es gram finnum
E4 V	Hfr III, 18:3-4	snǫrp varð at þat *sverða* ‖ *snót* / Eiríki á móti
XE4	Hfr V, 7:5-6	en trauðr / þvít vel *Viðris* ‖ *vald* hugnaðisk skaldi
D1	Eg I, 1:3-4	hjaldrsnerrandi *harra* ‖ *hǫfuðbaðmr* þría jǫfra
C	Rdr 17:1-2	ok *borðróins barða* ‖ *brautar þvengr enn ljóti*
A1[1]	Gráf 7:1-2	mælti *mætra hjalta* ‖ *Malmóðinn sá* / blóði
A2[1]	VGl 4:1-2	eigi sofnak *Ófnir* ‖ *ýseims* í bœ þeima
A3[1]	Haustl 10:1-2	urðut *brattra borða* ‖ *byggvendr* at þat hryggvir
A1[2]	Gldr 7:1-2	ríks / þreifsk *reiddra ǫxa* ‖ *rymr* / knáttu spjǫr glymja
A3[2]	Þjsk I, 2:3-4	þú rautt *Skǫglar skýja* ‖ *skóð* / forvistu góða
A2[3]	Haustl 14:1-2	eðr of sér / es *jǫtna* ‖ *ótti* lét of sóttan
A3[3]	Eyv lv 1:3-4	oss gerask hneppt / *ens hvassa* ‖ *hefnendr* / setu efni
A2[4]	Þjóð IV, 2:1-2	fariða ér / áðr *fleyja* ‖ *flatvǫllr* heðan batnar
A3[4]	Hfr III, 20:1-2	veitkat hitt / hvárt *Heita* ‖ *hungrdeyfi* skalk leyfa
A2[5]	Rdr 2:3-4	meyjar hjóls *enn mæri* ‖ *mǫgr Sigvarðar* Hǫgna.

It follows that enjambment from an even line, with only one alliterating stave in initial position, to an odd line is also unmetrical, and such enjambment is very rare. In ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* it occurs less than fifteen times, and in three of those instances the poet added a second stave to accommodate the restrictions imposed by alliteration (Rdr 9:2-3, Korm lv 41:2-3, GSúrs 27:6-7):[20]

Rdr 9:2-3	Bœtiþrúðr at *móti* ‖ *malma* mætum hilmi
Korm lv 41:2-3	hornþeyjar vit *Freyja* ‖ *fjarðarleggs en frægja*
GSúrs 27:6-7	hǫnd væri *því bandi* ‖ *báls* í benja éli
Haustl 5:2-3	Fárbauta mǫg *Váru* ‖ *þekkiligr* með þegnum
Gldr 6:6-7	holmreyðar lét *olman* ‖ *lindihjǫrt* fyr landi
Gldr 8:2-3	margspakr / *Niðar varga* ‖ *lundr* vann sókn á sandi
Gldr 8:6-7	allr herr Skota *þverri* ‖ *lǫgðis seiðs* af láði.

Likewise, enjambment involving the elements of a nominal phrase in Type A1, with alliteration in positions 1 and 3, is almost exclusively restricted to Types A1[1-2], in which the nomina in positions 3-6 form a syntactic unit, as in the following examples:

Þmáhl 14:1-2	hétu *hirðinjótar* ‖ *haukaness* til þessa
Korm lv 64:1-2	dunði *djúpra benja* ‖ *dǫgg* ór mækis hǫggvi
Hfr V, 15:7-8	leyfik *ljóssa vífa* ‖ *lund* / sem ǫlpt á sundi
Hfr I, 5:3-4	átti *eingadóttur* ‖ *Ónars* viði gróna
Eyv lv 11:1-2	skyldak *skerja foldar* ‖ *skíðrennandi* síðan.

Enjambment on the word in the cadence only is almost nonexistent, and, in the corpus of *dróttkvætt* poetry from the ninth and tenth centuries, there are only four examples of such connections, three of which occur in *lausavísur*:

Styrr 1:5	uggik eigi *seggja* ‖ *ofrgang* of mik strangan
Þmáhl 6:3-4	hrafn naut hræva / *Gefnar* ‖ *hjaldrskýja* mik frýju
Hfr V, 7:1-2	ǫll hefr ætt til *hylli* ‖ *Óðins* skipat ljóðum
Sindr 8:5-6	gerra gramr í *snerru* ‖ *geirvífa* sér hlífa.

Occasionally, the requirements of alliteration in Type A1^2 prompted the formation of inverted *kenningar* in which the alliterating nomen in the second line forms a unit with the alliterating nomen in positions 3-4, and the nonalliterating nomen in the cadence is modified by the alliterating sequence ń+ń:

Eyv lv 8:7-8	meldr í *móður* holdi ‖ *Mellu dolgs* of folginn
VGl 11:7-8	Gríms í *Gǫndlar* flaumi ‖ *Gefnar* mák of hefna
Hfr V, 14:1-2	ek brá *elda* støkkvi ‖ *ǫlnaskeiðs* af reiði
Korm lv 22:5-6	dýrt verðr *dǫggvar* kerti ‖ *Draupnis* margt at kaupa.

The reluctance to carry over nominal elements with the sequence n+ń accounts for the lack of syntactic cohesion between lines 2 and 3, as well as for the inverted *kenningar* in Type A1^2 and the absence of enjambment in Types A1$^{3-4}$ Odd.[21]

Vertical placement of disrupted syntactic elements within a couplet may or may not involve alliteration, depending on whether the disrupted elements occur in line-initial or in line-final position. Consider the following examples from Type E3:

Vell 32:7-8	*rammaukin* kveðk ríki ‖ *rǫgn* Hákonar magna
Hfr III, 16:1-2	*ógrœðir* sá auða ‖ *armgrjóts* Trǫnu fljóta
Hfr III, 25:5-6	*grams dauði* brá gœði ‖ *góðs* ófárar þjóðar
Eg lv 26:5-6	*arfstóli* knák Ála ‖ *áttgǫfguðum* hattar
Eg lv 10:3-4	*þreklundaðr* fell / Þundar ‖ *Þórólfr* / í gný stórum.

The former placement is by far the more common, and in the few cases in which the first element does not alliterate (Types A3$^{3-4}$), it tends to belong to a lexico-grammatical category that in eddic poetry may precede a nomen without carrying alliteration, such as an adjectival pronoun or *margr, allr*:

HolmgB 9:3-4	*þau* beri menn frá morði ‖ *mín orð* / tigar fjorða
Hfr III, 17:7-8	*mǫrg* óð bitr í blóði ‖ *benkneif* / fyr Áleifi
Korm lv 50:7	*mitt* kveðk slætt í sveita ‖ *sverð* fordæðu gerðu
GSúrs 8:7-8	*þann* lét lundr of lendan ‖ *landkostuð* ábranda
Vell 31:7-8	*allt* vann gramr of gengit ‖ *Gautland* / frá sjá randir.

Unlike in eddic *fornyrðislag* (and in the skaldic meter *kviðuháttr*), proclitic adjectival pronouns, as well as *allr* and *margr*, always alliterate in odd *dróttkvætt* lines, and the fact that they could occur as proclitic modifiers in vertical placement without alliteration could very well indicate a shared remnant from a common past.

According to Kuhn's calculations, vertical placement of disrupted sentences occurred in 41 percent of the 167 *helmingar* from the ninth and the tenth century which were examined in Reichardt's 1928 study of skaldic clause arrangement (Kuhn 1929:196). Kuhn concluded, therefore, that vertical placement was unintentional and that vertical placement beyond a couplet appears to have been avoided (ibid.). Mohr, on the other hand, disagreed with Kuhn and claimed that, if Reichardt (and Kuhn) had accounted for the vertical placement of sentence elements and not only disrupted clauses, the number of vertically placed elements could easily have been doubled (Mohr 1933:13).

A look at the types of lines in couplets with vertical placement shows that the percentage of such connections is by far the highest in odd lines of Types E3, C, A1^2, A3$^{3-4}$, and A2$^{4-5}$, that is, lines in which the first alliteration falls on a single nomen, compound, or a similar syntactic unit followed by a verb or a proclitic preposition or particle, as in the following examples:

E3	Korm lv 33:5-6	*naddhríðar* skalk níða ‖ *Njót* / svát steinar fljóti
C	Haustl 18:7-8	en *Bergdana* bægði ‖ *brjótr* við jǫrmunþrjóti
A1^2	Hfr III, 9:3-4	*geirs* við gumna stjóra ‖ *geigurþing* at eiga
A2^4	Gldr 6:1-2	*grennir* þrǫng at gunni ‖ *gunnmás* fyr haf sunnan
A2^5	Haustl 6:7-8	*Hirðitýr* meðal herða ‖ *herfangs* ofan stǫngu
A3^3	Eg I, 2:1-2	nú liggr *hæst* und hraustum ‖ *hreinbraut* Aðalsteini
A3^4	Vell 11:1-2	rignði *hjǫrs* á hersa ‖ *hríðremmis* fjǫr víða.

Conversely, the types of even lines which most frequently accommodate vertical placement are Types E3-4, A2k, D2, A^2, and A^5, in which the initial positions tend to be occupied by suspended elements and the majority of words in initial vertical placement are disrupted members of nominal phrases. If the vertically placed elements occur within the same couplet, they almost always alliterate, and the high frequency of vertical placement in initial position shows that such a linking by alliteration must have been part and parcel of skaldic compositional technique. Vertically placed elements that are extended beyond the couplet tend to occur in fixed positions, that is, in those positions that accommodate suspended constituents

and parts of disrupted phrases (initial position in even lines of Types E3-4, A2k, D2, A², A⁵, and odd lines of Types D1 and A2⁵). Consider the following *helmingar*:

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Vell 18   *engi* varð á jǫrðu
     ættum góðr nema Fróði
     Gætinjǫrðr / (sás gerði)
     geirbríkar / (frið slíkan).

GSúrs 23:1-5   *dýr* lét drápu stjóra
     dís til svefns of vísat
     lægis elds / (þars lágu)
     (lítt týnik því) / (dýnur).

</div>

These *helmingar* clearly demonstrate how the suspended nominal elements in initial position provided the necessary rhyme and alliteration for the words in line-final position. It is doubtful whether extended vertical placement was used consciously as a means to clarify the syntax; rather, the recurrence of vertically placed elements probably resulted from the skaldic practice of assigning suspended consituents and parts of disrupted phrases to patterns that could accommodate nomina in positions 1, 1-2, and 1-3.

Although vertical placement is quite common in *dróttkvætt* stanzas, enjambment between an odd line and the following even line is a much more frequently used device for linking syntactic units and constituents that belong to the same clause. In *dróttkvætt* poetry from the ninth and tenth centuries, enjambment occurs in around 70 percent of the couplets, and 20 percent of these instances involve enjambment on the elements of a nominal phrase across the metrical caesura. According to Kuhn, such enjambment was favored by the ninth-century poets Bragi and Þjóðólfr, and in later *dróttkvætt* poetry it became increasingly rare (Kuhn 1983:187). Without examining the occurrences of enjambment in the eleventh to fourteenth centuries, it is impossible to test the tenability of Kuhn's statement (he gives no statistical evidence), but, as far as the tenth century is concerned, enjambment clearly remained one of the favored devices of straddling the metrical caesura. Kuhn correctly observes, however, that Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa" contains a much higher percentage of enjambment than the average tenth-century poem. In "Ragnarsdrápa," 34 percent of the couplets have enjambment on nominal units (as opposed to the average 20 percent), and if one adds enjambment involving the sequences finite verb+nominal constituent and nomen+adjectival attributive, that percentage increases to 50 percent. The number of sentences with enjambment in "Ragnarsdrápa" totals 92 percent, which is 22 percent above the average. The extensive use of enjambment in Bragi's poem is partly because of his preference for the one-clause and sequence patterns, but at the same time the percentage is more than average. A simple clause arrangement

coupled with the use of enjambment as a cohesive device was strongly favored by Bragi, and it is very likely that these features, along with the irregular placement and form of the internal rhymes, the occasional even C-lines and odd B-lines, the preference for even lines of Type A, and the avoidance of odd lines of Types A2k and E4 were characteristic of the earliest *dróttkvætt* poetry.

Enjambment is quite common in eddic *fornyrðislag*, and it usually follows the same rules as *dróttkvætt* with regard to alliteration. Consider the following examples:[22]

B		
Vsp 60:7-8	oc á Fimbultýs	
	fornar rúnar	
HH I, 3:7-8	oc und mána sal	
	miðian festo	
C		
Vsp 27:1-2	veit hon Heimdalar	
	hlióð um fólgit	
HH II, 22:3-4	oc bergscorar	
	brattar klífa	
A¹		
Vsp 41:1-2	fylliz fiǫrvi	
	feigra manna	
Od 23:1-2	mælto margir	
	mínir niðiar	
A³		
Þrk 12:1-2	ganga þeir fagra	
	Freyio at hitta	
Od 30:7-8	vilda ec fylkis	
	fiǫrvi biarga.	

Occasionally enjambment can involve nonalliterating, proclitic, pronominal adjectives and such adjectives as *allr* and *margr*, as in Vsp 47:7-8 *áðr Surtar þann // sefi of gleypir* and Vsp 1:1-2 *hlióðs bið ec allar // helgar kindir*. However, the most conspicuous feature of eddic *fornyrðislag* is the scarcity of enjambment in Types E3-4, E3-4 Verbal, D1-2, A2k, and A1, that is, the very types that in *dróttkvætt* are either characterized by verbal fillers in positions 3 or 3-4 (E3-4, A2k), by sentence boundaries after position 4 (E3-4 Verbal), by inverted *kenningar*

(D1-2), or by an extremely low number of occurrences (E4, A2k, D1, and A2$^{1-2}$). That circumstance cannot be fortuitous and will be explored in detail in Chapter 8.

To sum up: the Norse metrical and grammatical treatises by Snorri Sturluson and his nephew, Óláfr Þórðarson, show that thirteenth-century poets and theorists considered alliteration to be a fundamental structuring device in skaldic poetry; that is, alliteration helped to delineate the syntax and to emphasize the coherence between words that belonged together syntactically. Similar evidence can be gleaned from the *dróttkvætt* stanzas themselves, and it is clear that both enjambment and vertical placement with alliteration within a couplet were crucial to the skaldic technique of composition.

The same restrictions of alliteration which governed the syntactic arrangement in odd lines applied across the metrical caesura. Patterns that would entail the sequence n+ń, such as A1$^{3-4}$, were excluded from direct enjambment on two nominal elements, and enjambment from an even line with one alliterating stave in initial position to the following odd line was almost nonexistent. Hence strong syntactic cohesion between lines 2 and 3 of a *helmingr* was virtually impossible.

Vertical placement within a couplet usually involved alliterating nomina in initial position, and it is clear that the skalds used vertical placement, like enjambment, to forge elements that belonged together and to emphasize syntactic coherence. Extended vertical placement throughout the half-stanza is rare, and it is doubtful whether that type of vertical placement was employed consciously to create a specific effect; rather, it appears that the recurrence of vertically placed elements was due to other factors, such as the accommodation of suspended nominal elements in fixed positions in lines of Types E3-4, A2k, D2, A$^{2-3,\,5}$ Even and D1, A2^5 Odd.

Enjambment was very common in *dróttkvætt* poetry, and it occurs with surprising frequency in "Ragnarsdrápa." The high percentage of enjambment in Bragi's poetry is intimately connected with his preference for simple, consecutive clause arrangements that show clear ties to eddic tradition. It is possible that the predilection for enjambment evidenced by the early skalds was responsible for the absence of even B- and C-lines which constitutes one of the main differences between skaldic *dróttkvætt* and eddic *fornyrðislag*. Even lines of Types B and C were poorly suited for enjambment, and, although Bragi makes a valiant effort to incorporate such lines into his schemes of enjambment, as in Rdr 9:7-8 *jǫfrum ulfs at sinna || með algífris lifru* and Rdr 18:1-2 *þás forns Litar flotna || á fangboða ǫngli*, that experiment was never repeated by later poets, and the main stave in *dróttkvætt* became fixed on the first syllable. In eddic *fornyrðislag*, enjambment was also quite common, but direct enjambment on two nominal elements was avoided in certain types of odd lines, such as Types D1-2, E3-4, E3-4 Verbal, A2k, and A1; that is, types that are characterized by low frequency and sentence boundaries after position 4 (E3-4 Verbal) in *dróttkvætt* meter.

Conclusion

Summary of the Previous Chapters: Types of Fillers

Odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines were structured according to underlying patterns based on an interchange of long and short syllables (Snorri's "samstöfur lángar eða skammar" 'long or short syllables'; *SnE* I:594). The long and short positions were occupied by words belonging to three classes of lexico-grammatical categories, namely long ($\bar{\times}$, i.e., nomina, etc., with more than two morae), short ($\breve{\times}$), and formwords ($\times$). These syllabic sequences can be divided into the following three groups: group I (Types E, B: $\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times\breve{\times}\bar{\times}\times$; $\times\bar{\times}\times\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times$), group II (Types D, A2k, C: $\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times$; $\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\bar{\times}\times\bar{\times}\times$; $\times\bar{\times}\breve{\times}\times\bar{\times}\times$), and group III (Type A: $\bar{\times}\times\bar{\times}\times\bar{\times}\times$). Odd lines in group I are characterized by alliteration in positions 1 and 5 (Types E3-4, E3-4 Verbal), positions 2 and 5 (Type B), and positions 4 and 5 (Types XE3-4). In group II, alliteration falls in positions 1 and 5 (D, A2k) and 2 and 5 (Type C), and odd lines belonging to the third group have alliteration in positions 1 and 3 (Type A1), 1 and 5 (Type A2), and in positions 3 and 5 (Type A3). All even lines have one alliterating stave, the main stave (*hǫfuðstafr*), which is fixed in initial position.

Because of the requirements of alliteration, no single nonalliterating nomen can occur proclitically to the alliterating stave in position 5. Hence in odd lines, nominal fillers in position 4 (E3-4, E3-4 Verbal) and positions 3-4 (A2k, A2^1) are prohibited, unless position 4 alliterates (Craigie's law). That restriction accounts for the main differences in syntactic fillers between odd and even lines, and between the fillers of odd hexasyllabic *dróttkvætt* lines and odd tetrasyllabic *fornyrðislag* lines. It also explains the absence of odd *dróttkvætt* lines of Type A2^2, the low number of odd D2-lines, and the inverted *kenningar* in Types D1-2 and C, in which the first member of a bisemantic compound forms a syntactic unit with the alliterating nomen in the cadence.

Clause Functions

Within the syntactic frame of the half-stanza, each type of line fulfills a specific function. Odd lines with the first alliterating stave in position 1, 3, or 4 and a finite verb in position 1 (Types B, C, E3 Verbal, A$^{2-3}$), 1-2 (Types A$^{1,\,4}$), 2 (Types E4

Verbal, XE4, A$^{2-3}$), 2-3 (Types E3 Verbal, XE3, A^{2}), 3 (Types E4 Verbal, A^{2}, A^{4}), 3-4 (Type A2k), or 4 (Types E3-4) are sentence introductory and introduce independent clauses, whereas odd lines with a connective in initial position (B, C, A3) introduce bound clauses. Odd lines of Types D1-2, A1^{1} (nominal), and A2^{5} always occupy the third line of the *helmingr* (sentence continuing), and contain suspended or disrupted sentence elements. Types B and C, with a preposition in position 1, are also assigned to line 3, and they accommodate longer prepositional phrases that occupy the whole line.

Even lines are usually either sentence continuing or concluding. The most common patterns are Types E3-4, D2, A2k, and A$^{2-3}$, that is, patterns that can accommodate a single nomen or nominal phrase in initial position. As in sentence-continuing odd lines (Types D1-2, A1^{1}, A2^{5}), these nomina tend to be suspended sentence elements and genitival or adjectival attributives that modify a base word from an earlier line.

Parenthetic clauses occupy one whole line (one-line clauses) or part of a line (sectional clauses), and they occur mostly in lines 2 and 3. One-line parenthetic clauses are stereotyped, with verbal echoes and insignificant content (especially even lines of Types A2k Verbal and E4 Verbal; e.g., Hfr V, 9:6 *erumk leið sonar reiði*, Þmáhl 8:6 *hrafn sleit af ná beitu*). Sectional clauses are favored in certain patterns and are often characterized by rhetoric emphasis (E2-4 Verbal; e.g., Eg lv 20:6 *greypts hennar skap / þenna*, TE 5:8 *skala ugga þat / hǫggvit*, Eg lv 16:8 *eiðsært es þat / greiða*, Eg lv 10:7 *helnauð es þat / hylja*). The content matter of these clauses differs depending upon whether or not it is found in encomiastic poetry or *lausavísur* (object oriented vs. subject oriented works, see below). Certain types of sectional clauses prompted the creation of stylistic devices like *hjástælt* (and also *tilsagt*: Ht 13, 25; *SnE* I:618, 634-36), but in the ninth and tenth centuries, Kormákr was the only poet who consciously employs *hjástælt* throughout a longer poem ("Sigurðardrápa"). It is possible that the mythological character of the parenthetic *hjástælt* insertions in "Sigurðardrápa" was influenced by the form and subject matter of a frequently repeated line from Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng" (Haustl 6:2 *svangr / vas þat fyr lǫngu*).

Each line of the *helmingr*, then, has clearly defined structural assignments. The first line is always sentence introductory; the second line continues or concludes a sentence from line 1; the third line introduces a new clause (usually continued in line 4) and/or contains nominal suspended elements; and line 4 concludes the *helmingr* syntactically. This completion can involve the whole line, the initial position(s), or the final position(s). The conclusion usually contains syntactically necessary elements, relieving earlier tension created by syntactic interruption (see Mohr 1933:5-7; D. Edwards 1983:166-75). Consider the following examples:

Gldr 4:5-8   ok alsnœfrir jǫfrar
                    orðalaust at morði
                    (endisk rauðra randa
                    rǫdd) / dynskotum kvǫddusk.

Gldr 5:1-4   háði gramr / (þars gnúðu)
                    geira hregg við seggi
                    (rauð fnýsti ben blóði)
                    (bryngǫgl í dyn Skǫglar).

Eg lv 14:5-8   verðk í feld / (þás foldar
                    faldr kømr í hug skaldi
                    Bergóneris) / brúna
                    brátt miðstalli hváta.

Eg lv 41:1-4   þverra nú / (þeirs þverðu)
                    þingbirtingar Ingva
                    (hvar skalk mildra manna)
                    (mjaðveitar dag) / (leita).

A sentence introduced in initial position in the first line tends to be the syntactically and semantically dominant clause in the *helmingr*, unless it is short and independent, or the second clause is an *at*-clause (*veitk, at*, etc.) that functions as the object of the finite verb in the first clause. Sentences introduced in the third line are either parenthetic, or they are extended to cover the whole or parts of the following even line.

Connections between an odd line and the following even line can proceed according to three patterns: direct connection (enjambment); vertical placement; and indirect connection with insertion. The first pattern is by far the most common. Both Reichardt and Edwards concluded that the clause arrangements are much less complicated than was earlier believed and that the sequence pattern and the frame pattern prevail (Reichardt 1928:52; D. Edwards 1983:144-47). Sentence intercalation in *dróttkvætt* stanzas is subject to the rule that no third clause can be introduced before one of the former is concluded; that is, no *helmingr* can at the same time accommodate disrupted elements from three different sentences (Reichardt 1928:76-77), and, in that respect, the clause arrangement in a *helmingr* follows the same rule of syntactic division as the individual line (see below).[1]

Sentence Boundaries

Sentence boundaries in *dróttkvætt* stanzas are either soft or hard, that is, sentence boundaries after which the onset of the new clause is signaled by an introductory element and sentence boundaries that are not followed by those elements (see Kuhn 1983:197-99). Hard sentence boundaries are avoided in odd lines, and such syntactic breaks are very rare in lines belonging to groups I-II, except in sectional parenthetic clauses in Types E3-4 Verbal. By comparison, soft sentence boundaries occur regularly in Types A^{2-5} Odd, in which the proclitic ×-positions (positions 2, 4) can be occupied by introductory elements:

Rdr 6:3	flaums / þás fjǫrvi næma
Rdr 5:1	þar / svát gerðu gyrðan
Eg lv 32:1	fell / sás flest et illa
Gldr 4:1	þar / svát barsk at borði
Eg lv 11:3	ótt vas él / þats sóttak
Haustl 14:1	eðr of sér / es jǫtna
Rdr 9:5	svá lét ey / þótt etti
Þjóð IV, 2:1	fariða ér / áðr fleyja
Haustl 2:5	settisk ǫrn / þars æsir
Haustl 8:3	sveita nagr / svát slitna.

In even lines, whose main function was to accommodate suspended and disrupted elements, hard sentence boundaries occur with relatively high frequency, and soft sentence boundaries are rare, except when a new clause is introduced in position 4, line 2 (e.g., Rdr 16:2 *vilgi slakr / es rakðisk*, Hfr V, 28:6 *valdi guð / hvar aldri*).

We may conclude then, that sentence-introductory lines avoided syntactic breaks unless these breaks were clearly marked. There is no support for Kuhn's contention that all *dróttkvætt* lines contained syntactic caesuras, and that is especially evident in those cases in which he places a caesura after position 4 (E3-4: e.g., Haustl 18:1 *fjǫrspillir lét | falla*, Haustl 3:5 *margspakr of nam | mæla*; A2k: e.g., Eil III, 1:1 *setbergs kveða | sitja*; A3: e.g., GSúrs 28:1 *hugðak Geymi- | gǫndul*; XE3-4: eg., Eg lv 5:3 *né fágak dul | drjúgan*, Gráf 4:3 *þar varð í gný | geira*; B: e.g., Haustl 2:7 *vasa Byrgitýr | bjarga*; C: e.g., Rdr 10:5 *es þrymregin | þremja*). Rather, odd *dróttkvætt* lines were characterized by a high degree of syntactic cohesion, especially between the word in position 4 and the word in the cadence. The fact that there are no *dróttkvætt* A-lines with the structure SSSS+SS (†*herðimýlum hǫrðum*), further supports that arrangement.

Syntax and Word Order

In independent clauses, finite verbs occur in the same positions as in prose (V1-2) and we can posit the following rule of word order: in independent clauses, no new sentence can be introduced before the finite verb.[2] The finite verbs in clauses with extraposed elements occupy the same predictable positions as in clauses without extraposition; that is, clauses with extraposed elements follow the usual sentence-introductory patterns (e.g., Vell 12:2-3 [*harðr*] / *Lopts vinar* / [*barða*] ‖ *því kom vǫxtr í Vínu*). Clauses with extraposed introductory elements have the word order of bound clauses, as in the following examples:

Vell 9	(margt varð él) / áðr / (Ála)
	austr lǫnd at mun banda
	randar lauks af ríki
	rœkilundr *of tæki*.
Gráf 13	(kunni tolf) / sás / (tanna)
	tíðum / (Hallinskíða)
	(ógnar stafr) / of jǫfra
	(íþróttir) / *framm sótti*.

Extraposition in *dróttkvætt* lines is subject to the rule that no more than one sentence element can be extraposed.

The finite verbs in bound clauses introduced in even lines tend to be contained in the same line (usually in the cadence, e.g., Rdr 16:2 *vilgi slakr* / *es rakðisk*). Bound clauses introduced in an odd line are usually longer, and the verbs can occur in the same line (e.g., Haustl 6:5 *áðr djúphugaðr dræpi*), in the next line (e.g., Haustl 15:5-6 *þás hofregin hafrar* ‖ *hógreiðar framm drógu*), or in the final line, usually in the cadence (e.g., Gldr 4:5, 8 *ok allsnæfrir jǫfrar* ‖ - ‖ - ‖ [*rǫdd*] / *dynskotum kvǫddusk*). If a bound clause is introduced in the first line of the *helmingr* and concluded in the fourth, and the third line introduces a new clause, the finite verb is usually introduced before the syntactic break in line 3. We must conclude then that the finite verbs are the most important syntactic structuring devices in the sentences and that they must occur prior to the introduction of new syntactic material.

The subjects in skaldic sentences are relegated to fixed positions. In independent clauses, most subjects occur proclitically or enclitically to the verb or in the following line, most often in initial position. If the subject is suspended, it is often introduced in line 3, especially in initial position in lines of Type A2[5], as in the following *helmingar*:

Gráf 8   heinþyntan lét hvína
                  hrynjeld at þat brynju
                  foldar vǫrðr / sás fyrðum
                  fjǫrnharðan sik varði.

Þjsk II, 1   opt með œrna giptu
                  ǫðlings himins rǫðla
                  Jóta gramr enn ítri
                  Englandi rauð branda.

We have seen that it is immaterial whether the base words or adjectival or genitival attributives with suspended completion occupy the traditional position of the subject, and lines like Vell 34:1 *hjalmfaldinn bauð hildi* and Korm lv 5:5 *haukmœrar kvað hári* would have been just as syntactically transparent as Hfr III, 6:1 *herskerðir klauf harðan*. The presence of syntactically incomplete subjects in sentence-introductory lines did not constitute breaks in the word order (or "caesuras"), and lines containing such phrases could contain sentence boundaries that did not coincide with the syntactic incompletion, as in Gráf 2:5 *foldar rauð / ok felldi*. There can be no doubt that the predictable placement of the finite verb and the subject, which to a great extent follows the word order of prose (especially in independent clauses), must have facilitated the comprehension of *dróttkvætt* stanzas.

Thus the syntactic organization of *dróttkvætt* poems was by no means haphazard (see Chap. 1, n.37). Rather, with the exception of the placement of finite verbs in bound clauses, which appears to be of Germanic origin (see Kuhn 1933:107-8), it followed fixed rules that to a great extent coincided with those of prose (and of eddic *fornyrðislag*). However, because of restrictions imposed by alliteration and syllable and mora counting, the word order of *dróttkvætt* stanzas was characterized by syntactic incompletion, extraposition, and embedding. Such devices are known from the alliterative tradition, too, as in Vsp 8:5-6 *unz þriár qvómo* || *þursa meyiar*, Beow 1200b-1200a *searoniðas fleah* || *Eormenrices*, Hel 2161b-2162a *Kristes uuârun thô* || *uuord gefullot* (see Kuhn 1933:74-75), HH I, 54:1-4 *kómo þar ór himni* || *hiálmvitr ofan* || (*óx geira gnýr*) || *þær er grami hlífðo*, Beow 15-17 *Beowulf wæs breme* || (*blæd wide sprang*) || *Scyldes eafera* || *Scedelandum in*, Hel 18-19a *Matheus endi Marcus* || (*sô uuârun thia man hêtana*) || *Lucas endi Iohannes*. But, owing to the stricter formal requirements, the syntax of *dróttkvætt* was more complex than that of alliterative poetry.

Scholars have long debated whether tmesis and lines with tripartite structures could occur in *dróttkvætt* stanzas (see Frank 1985:166-69). Although tmesis was by no means as common as Finnur Jónsson's *Skj* IB indicates, it occurs in the earliest *dróttkvætt* (*Ið-unnr*; Haustl 10), and in our excerpted corpus there are two other examples of such constructions (Gunnh 1: *Há-kon*, and Hfr II, 5 *Heiða-bý*). All

these instances of tmesis involve personal names or place names, and it is likely that tmesis, just like the variant fillers *detthent* (Haustl 13:8 *bifkleif at Þórleifi*), *stamhent* (Korm lv 38:1 *esa mér sem Tinteini*), and Kuhn's Types B1 and Ck[3] (ÞKolb III, 12:7 *rauð Hringmaraheiði*), resulted from the skalds' attempt to incorporate proper names in the syllabic frame of *dróttkvætt* lines (see also Kuhn 1983:111).[3] We have also seen that restrictions of alliteration prompted the formation of such inverted *kenningar* as *salbrigðandi Sveigðis* (Sindr 5:7), *þrymregin þremja* (Rdr 10:5), and the structure of these *kenningar* clearly shows how the formal requirements prompted new creations that set *dróttkvætt* apart from the alliterative tradition. However, as Egill's inverted *kenning dalmiskunn fiska* (Eg lv 6:4) demonstrates, there can be no doubt that these constructions, which probably originated as pure makeshifts, were put to good use as conscious artistic devices by later poets.

Arguing from his conviction that all odd *dróttkvætt* lines are divided by one syntactic caesura, Kuhn denied the existence of such tripartite constructions as Vell 9:1 *margt varð él / áðr / Ála* and Gráf 13:1 *kunni tolf / sás / tanna* (Kuhn 1929:200-201, 1983:169; cf. Frank 1985:167-68). He did admit that even lines could contain such divisions (e.g., Eg V, 1:2 *ljósgarð / es þák / barða*), and in some lines he went so far as to assign four syntactic caesuras, as in Korm lv 19:4 *ljós / þér / at ver / kjósa* (Kuhn 1983:170). As we have seen, tripartite constructions were certainly possible in even lines (see Egill's line, above), but in *dróttkvætt* poems from the ninth and tenth centuries, there are no even lines that contain elements belonging to three different clauses; that is, even *dróttkvætt* lines could only accommodate elements from two different clauses, either as a sequence (one sentence boundary; e.g., Rdr 13:4 *rauk / Danmarkar auka*) or with embedding (two sentence boundaries; e.g., Vell 12:2 *harðr / Lopts vinar / barða*). Thus there is no evidence to support Kuhn's contention that even *dróttkvætt* lines could have syntactically tetrapartite structures, and it is clear that, just as the *dróttkvætt* half-stanza could not simultaneously accommodate three syntactically incomplete clauses (Reichardt 1928:76-77, and above), the *dróttkvætt* line could not contain constituents from three different clauses.

The same principle seems to hold true for odd lines: in three of the lines that, according to our interpretation, contain two sentence boundaries, the elements straddling the embedded connective belong to the same clause (Vell 9:1 *margt varð él / (áðr) / Ála*, Gráf 13:1 *kunni tolf / (sás) / tanna*, VGl 5:3 *þat sá / dóms / í draumi*). In the fourth example, Hfr III, 21:7 *heilalíkn / ef / hauka*, the words in positions 1-3, 4, and 5-6 belong to three different sentences (*væri oss heilalíkn; ef jǫfurr lifði; þótt œrir elds hauka háklifs þeim svikum beldi*). However, the line is not sentence introductory, and the suspended genitival attributive *hauka háklifs* concludes the main clause of the *helmingr*, so in that respect the syntactic arrangement of Hallfreðr's line corresponds to Reichardt's observation that no third clause can be introduced in a *helmingr* until one of the first two clauses has been

completed (Reichardt 1928:77). But the fact that such a tripartite construction occurs in only one poem clearly shows that the syntactic divisions of odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines proceeded according to the following rule: *dróttkvætt* lines could contain tripartite constructions, but no line could accommodate elements belonging to three different clauses.

On a larger scale, the separation of syntactic units, tmesis, inverted *kenningar* and prepositional phrases, and tripartite structures are all manifestations of varying degrees of the same process, which can be demonstrated by the following examples:

Eg lv 21:7	***Bors niðjar*** feltk ***beðju***
GSúrs 27:2	***þremjahlunns*** ór ***brunni***
Hfr II, 1:6	***hjǫrva gnýs*** ok ***skýjum***
Þþyn 1:2	***hræs*** / es kømr at ***sævi***
Haustl 12:3	***hug***reynandi ***Hænis***
Jór 4:6	***golls*** landrekar ***þollum***
Vell 12:2	***harðr*** / Lopts vinar / ***barða***
Vell 9:1	margt varð ***él*** / áðr / ***Ála***
Haustl 10:3-4	þá vas ***Ið*** með jǫtnum ‖ ***Unnr*** nýkomin sunnan.

As we have seen, reflexes of that process can be found in alliterative poetry, as well (e.g., Vsp 8:5-6 *unz þriár qvómo ‖ þursa meyiar*, Beow 1200b-1200a *searoniðas fleah ‖ Eormenrices*, Hel 2161b-2162a *Kristes uuârun thô ‖ uuord gefullot*), and, just as the sophisticated *kenningar* in *dróttkvætt* can be traced to the conventional *kenning* system in alliterative poetry, the syntactic arrangement of *dróttkvætt* lines mirrors that of alliterative poetry, but on a much higher level of development.

Enjambment and Vertical Placement

Enjambment is the most common device to connect the two lines of a couplet, and direct connection with enjambment is especially characteristic of Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa." Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration (no non-allitaterating nomen could occur before an alliterating stave), certain types of fillers could accommodate enjambment (alliteration in position 5), while others could not (alliteration in positions 1 and 3; Types A1[3-4]). Hence in line 3, which usually contained clauses that were continued to cover parts of line 4, Types A2 and A3 predominate (e.g., Eg lv 45:3-4 *þann berk harm á hvarma ‖ hnitvǫllum mér /*, Rdr 2:3-4 *meyjar hjóls enn mæri ‖ mǫgr Sigvarðar Hǫgna*), and Type A1 is rare.

Enjambment between even and odd lines involves the prohibited sequence n+ń, and when such connections do occur, the skalds often added a secondary

alliterating stave in the odd line, as in Rdr 9:2-3 *Bœtiþrúðr at móti* ‖ *malma mœtum hilmi*. It is possible that the skalds' delight in enjambment was responsible for one of the crucial structural differences between *dróttkvœtt* and *fornyrðislag*, namely, the lack of even *dróttkvœtt* lines of Types C and B. Bragi did attempt such constructions (e.g., Rdr 9:7-8 *jǫfrum ulfs at sinna* ‖ *með algífris lifru*, Rdr 18:1-2 *þás forns Litar flotni* ‖ *á fangboða ǫngli*), but Þjóðólfr's "Haustlǫng," which represents a more sophisticated level of development, has no lines of these types.

Certain statements from "Háttatal" and the "Third Grammatical Treatise" show that both Snorri and his nephew Óláfr were keenly aware of the distinguishing and cohesive power of alliteration, and there can be no doubt that the fundamental structuring principle in *dróttkvœtt* was enjambment.

Vertical placement operates according to the same principles as enjambment, that is, syntactic cohesion is emphasized by means of alliteration, especially in initial position, as in the following examples:

Eg lv 28:7	*alfeigum* skýtr œgir ‖ *augum*
Korm I, 5:3	*Haptsœnis* geldk hánum ‖ *heið*
Vell 24:5	*Hlymnarfi* bað hverfa ‖ *hlífar flagðs*
Hfr III, 16:1	*ógrœðir* sá auða ‖ *armgrjóts*
Hfr III, 25:5	*grams dauði* brá gœði ‖ *góðs*.

Vertical placement within a couplet was probably a conscious device, but extended vertical placement seems to have been caused by other factors, such as the accommodation of suspended nominal elements in fixed position. Thus it is unlikely that the skalds used it for the purpose of delineating the syntax, as Reichardt believed (1928:139).

The Composition of Dróttkvætt *Poetry*

Skalds composing in *dróttkvœtt* meter had at their disposal stereotyped recurring patterns of types of fillers with fixed placement of rhyme and alliteration which fulfilled specific functions in the clause arrangement (sentence introductory, continuing, and concluding). As we have seen, most of those patterns have similar functions in eddic *fornyrðislag* (and, with formal variations, in *runhent* and *kviðuháttr*), and it is clear that the skaldic art did not entail the appropriation of an elaborate set of compositional rules (see Fidjestøl 1985:77). Rather, the syllabic patterns with their types of syntactic fillers and different clause functions were part and parcel of Norse poetic tradition and must have been available to the performing skalds on the subconscious level as a fundamental part of the poetic inventory.

The strict formal requirements of *dróttkvætt* resulted in syntactic incompletion, suspension of sentence elements, extraposition, and sentence intercalation. Parenthetic clauses (one-line and sectional) and nominal compounds with interchangeable elements provided the skalds with the rhymes and alliterations necessary to accommodate the words in the cadence and to link the odd and even lines of a couplet (enjambment, vertical placement). Hence patterns containing nominal compounds and similar syntactic units constituted the majority of the fillers of even lines. Consider the following examples:

(1) accommodation by interchangeable compound elements:

Húsdr 1:2	herreifum Áleifi
Hfr III, 10:4	folkreifum Áleifi
Hfr III, 29:2	hugreifum Áleifi
Hfr III, 25:8	flugstyggs sonar Tryggva
Hfr III, 22:4	læstyggs sonar Tryggva;

(2) accommodation by one-line clauses:

Jór 1	*b*ragningr réð í *bl*óði
	(*b*eið herr konungs reiði)
	(hús lutu *o*pt fyr *ei*sum)
	*ó*þjóðar slǫg rjóða;

(3) accommodation by disrupted nominal units and sectional clauses:

Hfr I, 7	grams rúni lætr glymja
	gunnríkr / (hinns hvǫt líkar)
	Hǫgna hamri slegnar
	heiptbráðr of sik váðir;

(4) enjambment:

Rdr 3:5-8	rósta varð ***í ranni***
	Randvés hǫfuðniðja
	þás hrafnbláir ***hefnðu***
	harma Erps of barmar;

(5) vertical placement:

Bbreiðv 6:1-4	spurðusk ***vár*** und vǫrðum
	verk Styrbjarnar merkjum
	(***jarnfaldinn*** hlóð ǫldum
	Eirekr í dyn geira).

The skill with which the skalds utilized these compositional tools depended on their artistic ability, and the poetry of the individual skalds reveals recurring stylistic features (see the discussions in Chaps. 4-6). A close examination of syntactic fillers and clause arrangements of the poetry of different skalds across the centuries along the lines proposed in this book would certainly yield valuable information about individual characteristics, as well as contribute to solving questions of dating and authorial attribution.

Encomiastic Poetry and Lausavísur

The content of encomiastic poems was object oriented, that is, the object of the eulogy and his actions were the center of the narrative. Unless the *helmingr* contained a bid for a hearing or reward, a poetic boast, or an affirmation of hearsay, the subjects and objects of sentences from encomiastic stanzas were usually in the third person and did not involve first-person pronouns.

In panegyrics, the protagonist or the antagonist (the chieftain's immediate opponent), or both, are circumscribed in elaborate nominal circumlocutions (Reichardt 1928:72). The actions described (battles, expeditions) and the praise of the chieftain's character and his generosity tend to be stereotyped and secondary to the intricacy of the *kenningar*. Consider the following examples, eulogizing the Norwegian kings Haraldr hárfagri (Gldr 3), Haraldr gráfeldr (Gráf 9:1-4), Óláfr Tryggvason (Hfr III, 7:5-8), and Earl Hákon (Vell 14):

Gldr 3	*hrjóðr* lét hæstrar tíðar
	harðráðr skipa borðum
	báru fáks ens bleika
	barnungr á log þrungit.
Gráf 9:1-4	varð á víðu borði
	viggjum hollr at liggja
	gætir Glamma sóta
	garðs Eylimafjarðar.
Hfr III, 7:5-8	*hirðir* stózk við harðan
	hnitvegg með fjol seggja
	víðis veltireiðar
	varghollr þrimu marga.
Vell 14	sjau fylkjum kom *silkis*
	(snúnaðr vas þat) / *brúna*
	geymir grundar síma
	grandvarr und sik / (landi).

Often the chieftain's name is interwoven in the verbal texture of the poem, and it occurs in places that can accommodate its syllabic structure, as in the following *helmingar* (A2k: Gldr 9, Eg I, 2; D2: Vell 17, Glúmr I, 1; E4: Hfr III, 17:5-8, Haustl 20:7-8):

Gldr 9

kømrat yðr né œðri
annarr konungmanna
gjǫfli rœmðr und gamlan
gnapstól *Haraldr* sólar.

Eg I, 2

nú liggr hæst und hraustum
hreinbraut *Aðalsteini*.

Vell 17

nú liggr allt und jarli
ímunborðs / fyr norðan
veðrgœðis stendr víða
Vík / *Hákonar* ríki.

Glúmr I, 1

brandr fær logs ok landa
lands *Eiríki* banda.

Hfr III, 17:5-8

áðr an Ormi næði
Eiríkr eða hlut meira
mǫrg óð bitr í blóði
benkneif / fyr *Áleifi*.

Haustl 20:7-8

baugs þák bífum fáða
bifkleif at *Þórleifi*.

Because of the length and complexity of the nominal circumlocutions, *helmingar* from panegyrics often contain a high number of suspended and disrupted elements that occur in predictable places in lines 2-4. Hence there was little room for one-line parenthetic clauses, and the accommodation of the disrupted and suspended elements was left to short sectional clauses or to elements belonging to the same clause or a secondary clause (inter-laced), as in the following:

Vell 14:1-4

sjau fylkjum kom *silkis*
(snúnaðr vas þat) / *brúna*
geymir grundar síma
grandvarr und sik / (landi).

Gldr 6:1-4   *grennir* þrǫng at gunni
                        gunnmás fyr haf sunnan
                        (sá vas gramr) / ok gumnum
                        (goðvarðr) / und sik jǫrðu.

Most panegyrics must have been premeditated, and they are syntactically more complex than *lausavísur*. That complexity is evidenced in more intricate clause arrangements, in an abundance of suspended sentence elements (especially the subject), and in tripartite structures. The following half-stanzas from "Vellekla" demonstrate that point:

Vell 29:1-4   þrymr varð logs / (þars lǫgðu
                        leikmiðjungar) / Þriðja
                        (arngreddir varð) / (odda)
                        (andvígr) / (saman randir).

Vell 12:1-4   hjalmgrápi vann hilmir
                        harðr / (Lopts vinar) / barða
                        (því kom vǫxtr í Vínu
                        vínheims) / fíandr sína.

Vell 23:1-4   ok til móts á Meita
                        mjúkhurðum framm þurðu
                        með svǫrgœli Sǫrva
                        sjau landrekar randa.

Vell 32:1-4   valfǫllum hlóð vǫllu
                        (varð ragna konr gagni)
                        hríðar áss / (at hrósa)
                        (hlaut Óðinn val) / *Fróða*.

The *lausavísur* in the sagas were subject oriented, that is, the narrative revolved around the skald and his environment. The stanzas were characterized by an abundance of personal pronouns that occurred in predictable places, for example, as encliticized subjects:

Eg lv 11:1   valkǫstum *hlóðk* vestan
Eyv lv 10:1   einn dróttin *hefk* áttan
Korm lv 33:5   naddhríðar *skalk* níða
Þmáhl 3:3   þar *ák* lífhvǫtuð leyfðan
Hfr V, 12:1   *ólk* / þars aldri véla
Korm lv 56:7   betr *annk* Siglságu
GSúrs 34:1   *hugðak* hlífar flagða.

or as direct or indirect objects, especially in Types E3-4 Even and Type A[4]:

Korm lv 33:4	Skíðinga *mér* níði
HolmgB 2:2	háraddar *mik* kvaddir
Eg lv 20:2	landalfr fyr *mér* sjǫlfum
GSúrs 19:6	vekjendr / þeirs *mik* sekðu
VGl 8:8	bendir *mér* ór hendi
Korm lv 46:4	gǫgnum / *mik* til þagnar.

Because the subject is often realized as a first-person pronoun, the *kenningar* usually circumscribe a person from the skald's immediate environment, that is, his opponent, lover, or beneficiary. These can *kenningar* describe the subject (as in the following examples from the *lausavísur* of Egill):

Eg lv 5:5-8	*at þrifreynis þjónar*
	þrír nakkvarir Hlakkar
	til hásalar Heljar
	helgengnir fǫr dvelja.
Eg lv 14:1-4	ókynni vensk / (ennis
	ungr þorðak vel forðum)
	haukaklifs / (at hefja)
	Hlín / (þvergnípur mínar).
Eg lv 41:1-4	þverra nú / (þeirs þverðu)
	þingbirtingar Ingva
	(hvar skalk mildra manna)
	(mjaðveitar dag) / leita.
Eg lv 15:5-8	þvít *Geirrótu gǫtva*
	gnýþings bragar fingrum
	rógs at ræsis veigum
	reifendr sumir þreifa.

or the object (as in the following examples from the *lausavísur* of Kormákr):

Korm lv 45:1-4	seinn þykki mér *søkkva*
	snyrtimóts ór Fljótum
	(sás) / *áttgrennir Unnar*
	(orð sendi mér norðan).

Korm lv 23:1-4   svá kveðk *Snyrtifreyju*
                   (snimr trúða ek brúði)
                   gamðis vangs of gengna
                   greipar báls ór skálum.

Korm lv 48:1-4   mjǫk hafa troll of troðna
                   (trúir mannr konu annars)
                   eldreið Áta foldar
                   ómissila *þissa.*

Korm lv 35:5-8   meðan *skerjarðar* Skarði
                   skorð man ek fyr norðan
                   (hvǫss angrar sú sessi
                   sótt) / *Þórketils dóttur.*

If the poet focuses on his own actions, the lack of nominal elements which arises from the scarcity of subjective (and objective) *kenningar* is remedied by long and intricate vocatives that function as nominal accommodators, as in the following *helmingar*:

GSúrs 20:5-8   þó munk *hyrs* at hváru
                   hafa *bláfoldar skafla*
                   snyrtigátt / (né sýtik)
                   snauð / þats mér verðr auðit.

Korm lv 31:1-4   framm þóttumk ek *fláttu*
                   Freyr mínum gram dreyra
                   Gauts at gatna móti
                   galdrs blóðfrekum halda.

In encomiastic poems from the ninth and tenth centuries, such vocatives are almost nonexistent, and the forms of address in the *lausavísur*, which occur in predictable places (see Frank 1990), must have fulfilled the same functions in *lausavísur* as the longer subjective *kenningar* in panegyrics. In panegyrics from the centuries after the conversion to Christianity, which are characterized by a lack of *kenningar* with pagan mythological reference, vocatives apparently could fulfill the same function as in the early *lausavísur* (see Frank 1990).

The clause arrangements in *lausavísur* are simpler than in premeditated encomiastic poems (see D. Edwards 1983:144-47), and the sequence pattern and frame pattern prevail. Enjambment is very common, and one-line and sectional parenthetic clauses with subjective content occur frequently (as opposed to the rarity of sectional clauses in panegyrics). Certain *lausavísur* that display a more

complex structure may have been premeditated (e.g., the stanzas containing Egill's and Gísli's elaborate onomastic puns), some of them may have belonged to longer sequences of poems (e.g., the Steingerðr poem, Gísli's dream stanzas), and some could have been the work of later interpolators (e.g. Eg lv 29, Korm lv, 52, GSúrs lv 2). Others display strong verbal and contextual affinities to eddic lays, and it could be that the skalds consciously tried to evoke associations with eddic models.

Clearly, then, the two main factors that account for the differences between panegyrics and *lausavísur* are the subject matter and the frame of composition (time). Stanzas from premeditated encomiastic poems are characterized by objective content matter, syntactic complexity, long nominal circumlocutions, sectional clauses of an objective character (unless they fell under the semantic categories "poetic boast," "bid for a hearing," "affirmation of hearsay"). Because of their nominal character, *helmingar* from panegyrics to a great extent favored patterns that could accommodate longer nominal units, such as Types D1-2, E3-4, A2k, C, and A2⁵. In contrast, the subject-oriented *lausavísur* tend to contain shorter sentences (often one-line parenthetic clauses of Types E3-4 Verbal, XE3-4, A2k Verbal), and the nominal accommodators are often contained in elaborate forms of address that obviate the lack of subject *kenningar*.

Performance

According to Snorri, *dróttkvætt* lines were characterized by sequences of long and short, hard and soft syllables that could, as a special license, be pronounced fast or slow (*SnE* I:594, 608-10). Whereas the former apparently referred to the standard phonetic realization of skaldic stanzas (syllabic length, accentuation), the latter designated resolution, neutralization, and contractions (enclitication). The reflexes of Snorri's "long" and "short" syllables are found in our patterns of syntactic fillers ($\bar{\times}, \bar{\times}, \times$), but the quality and placement of his "hard" and "soft" syllables, which must have been synonymous with Sneglu-Halli's "catches" and "falls," belong to a phonetic level that cannot be retrieved (see the earlier criticism of Sievers's metrical framework).

We have seen that internal rhymes were used to delineate the syntax and that the placement of the *frumhending* directly before a sentence boundary was especially prominent in even lines with sentence boundaries after position 1 (E2, D2, A2-3), as in the following lines:

HolmgB 11:4	morð / halfan tøg fjorða
Rdr 13:4	rauk / Danmarkar auka
Haustl 15:8	sundr / at Hrungnis fundi
Haustl 6:2	svangr / vas þat fyr lǫngu.

Conversely, lines of the same types with sentence boundaries after position 4 could have the first internal rhyme in positions 2 or 3:

Eg lv 20:6	greypts hennar skap / þenna
Vell 28:8	vágs blakkriði / Frakka
Kveld 1:2	norn erum grimm / til snimma.

In Types E4, A2k, and A⁵, both sentence boundaries and disrupted genitives appear to have been marked by the internal rhyme falling right before the syntactic break:

Gldr 6:4	goðvarðr / und sik jǫrðu
Eg lv 4:6	oddskýs fyr þér nýsa
Rdr 13:8	vallrauf / fjogur haufuð
Haustl 6:8	herfangs ofan stǫngu
Rdr 13:6	ennitungl / þars gingu
Rdr 4:2	sóknar alfs á golfi.

Syllabic cohesion, however, coincides with syntactic cohesion, that is, with a lack of sentence boundaries, and seems to fulfill the opposite function:

Vell 22:4	*fǫr ti*l Sogns of gǫrva
Haustl 6:2	svangr / vas *þat f*yr lǫngu
Þdís I, 2:8	Sví*vǫr n*umin lífi
VGl 6:2	*mun s*verðabrak verða
Eg lv 3:6	*vel g*lýjaðra þýja.

Thus syllabic cohesion equaled syntactic cohesion and breaks in syntax were signaled by lack of syllabic cohesion. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of metrically marked and unmarked syllables, that is, syllables distinguished by internal rhyme, syllabic length (and alliteration) set off the hard sentence boundaries in even lines. From this we can infer that the recitation of skaldic stanzas indeed delineated the syntax, and, moreover, that these features must have been inherent in the mode of composition. The lack of syllabic cohesion across syntactic breaks indicates that those caesuras were set off by a pause, whereas lines and structures that were characterized by syllabic cohesion were not. It is possible that such pauses were combined with a change of pitch, if we assume, as it seems we must, that syllables carrying rhyme and alliteration were emphasized during recitation, and syllables not so distinguished were not.

The features that distinguished skaldic recitation are nicely described by the poetic terminology in the sagas and the Norse metrical and grammatical treatises. The phonetic realization of the verbal texture of *dróttkvætt* was perceived as a regulated sequence of long and short, hard and soft syllables (*samfǫst orð* 'bound

or consecutive words') that moved on a physical level (*stíga* 'step,' 'move,' 'rise') or was set in motion by the performing skald (*flytja fram* 'set in motion'; see Chap. 1, pp. 22-23). When each syllable "moved" according to these well-established patterns of "catches" and "falls" (*fǫng* and *fǫll*), the motion was "smooth" (*mjúkr*; *SnE* I:680), but the smallest irregularities in syllabic length (e.g., *grǫm : skǫmm*) which upset the balance of sound and caused the individual "steps" on the phonetic path to be of unequal height (*ekki jafnhátt*), were perceived as "awkward" (*ǫfugt stígandi*). Sometimes a long syllable could be shortened to achieve the desired norm, as when Óláfr Þórðarson emended the D2-line *blóðs vindára róðri* to *blóðs vindara róðri* because "it sounds better" ("hljóðar betr"; *SnE* II:102). On other occasions phonetic irregularities created "thresholds" (*þreskǫlld*; *SnE* II:122), as in the collision between *-ks* and *sk-* in Snorri's *tvískelft*-line *skjaldbraks skylja mildum* (ibid.; *SnE* I:638), or "stumbling," "shivering," or "stuttering" effects (*detthent, skjalfhent, stamhent*; *SnE* I:640, 646, 658).

It is difficult to reconcile this picture with the notion of a musical recitation of *dróttkvætt* poetry, and we must conclude therefore that the delivery of *dróttkvætt* poems was characterized by loud, clear recitation (see Kuhn 1983:245), and probably by pauses and differences in pitch which delineated the syntax and set off syntactic breaks (see, Hollander 1965:636, 639; Reichardt 1928:140-41; Gade, 1994). It is likely that, as the scene in *Vatnsdæla saga* suggests, the recitation proceeded according to a fixed rhythm and that there indeed existed, at least in Iceland, a standard delivery of *dróttkvætt* poetry.

Eddic and Skaldic Poetry: The Origin of Dróttkvætt

Any attempt to trace the evolution of *dróttkvætt* by means of a comparison with the extant Norse alliterative tradition (*fornyrðislag*) meets with certain unavoidable obstacles and must be carried out with caution. The dating of the eddic poems is debated, and it is doubtful whether any of the poems in *fornyrðislag* in the Poetic Edda is as old as the ninth or tenth century.[4] The main manuscript (Codex Regius 2365, 4º) is from around 1270, and the transmission of the poems is in many cases corrupt. Furthermore, the apparent insertion of, for example, explanatory personal pronouns, which also occurs in skaldic poems in younger manuscripts, often obscures the patterns of syntactic fillers. We do not know to what extent skaldic poems influenced the eddic style (and vice versa; see Heusler 1956:230; Kuhn 1969a:211), and certain eddic poems (notably the first lay of Helgi and "Hymisqviða") are known for their "skaldic" features.

As Kuhn has shown, many of the lays with "South Germanic" antecedents contain fillers that appear to have been avoided in the native tradition (and in *dróttkvætt*), such as the sequence of three short syllables (e.g., Sg 25:7 *brúðr frumunga*, Sg 35:6 *þióðkonungar*, Sg 48:3 *oc hiǫrunduð*; Kuhn 1939), and we also

find trisyllabic lines (Rm 5:1 *þat scal gull*, Gðr I, 9:7 *hersis qván*; so-called "unterepische Füllungen," see Heusler 1956:225), as well as lines in which two short syllables fill the positions ×̄× (Þrk 20:1 *þá kvað Loki*), which were banned from *dróttkvætt*.

It is clear then that the poems in *fornyrðislag* contained in the Poetic Edda were not syllable counting and, furthermore, that they did not observe the same strict rules of mora counting as skaldic *dróttkvætt*. This heterogeneity of syllabic patterns led some scholars to wonder whether *fornyrðislag* was "rhythmical at all" (Kristján Árnason 1991:155), while others, notably Sievers and his followers, enforced radical emendations to restore the "original" tetrasyllabic metrical patterns (see Sievers 1885b). While there might be reason to suspect that at least some of Sievers's emendations were justified, it is equally clear that the thirteenth-century versions of the eddic poems cannot be stuffed or gutted to reconstruct hypothetical earlier forms. The following discussion of *fornyrðislag* therefore focuses on lines with approximate tetrasyllabic structures (with or without resolution and neutralization), and lines that display syllabic irregularities will not be considered.

Our earlier discussions (Chaps. 4-6) showed that most types of syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* lines also occur in eddic *fornyrðislag*. Consider the following examples:

	Odd Lines			*Even Lines*	
E2			*E2*		
			VGl 6:2	*mun sverðabrak* verða	
			Hlr 14:8	*søcstu, gýgiarkyn*	
E3			*E3*		
Oddr 1:5	*snarráðan kom* síðan		Rdr 5:2	*golfhǫlkvis sá* fylkis	
Hym 39:1	*þróttǫflugr kom*		Vsp 56:10	*Fiǫrgyniar burr*	
HHj 35:7	*Sigrlinnar sonr*				
E3 Verbal			*E3 Verbal*		
Eg lv 31:1	*fyrir þykki mér* fúra		Haustl 17:2	*bǫnd ollu því* / randa	
Fm 32:5	*spacr þætti mér*		Vsp 38:4	*norðr horfa dyrr*	
GSúrs 16:1	*vald eigi þú* vígi		Eg lv 34:4	*getk aldri vin* betra	
HH II, 18:1	*hirð eigi þú*		HHj 43:2	*kem ec eigi áðr*	
E4			*E4*		
Gráf 7:5	*víðlendr of bað* vinda		GSúrs 14:4	*malmrunnr* / *í sal* brunnu	
Br 19:1	*benvǫnd of lét*		Gðr II, 24:4	*iórbiúg í sal*	
HHj 43:3	*Rógheims á vit*		Rdr 8:2	*Óskrán at þat* sínum	
			HH I, 32:2	*Guðmundr at því*	

228

<div style="columns">

E4 Verbal

Halli 1:3	*ljúg vætr at mér* leygjar
Br 16:3	*svalt alt í sal*
Vell 22:7	*Ullr stóð á því* / allri
HH I, 2:1	*nótt varð í bœ*
Eg lv 10:7	*helnauð es þat* / hylja
HH I, 53:1	*svipr einn var þat*

B

Rdr 8:5	**þás Hristisif** hringa
HH II, 13:9	*enn Hǫgna mær*
Haustl 2:7	*vasa Byrgitýr bjarga*
Vsp 50:3	*snýz iǫrmungandr*
Rdr 20:3	*of manna sjǫt* margra
Vsp 44:7	*um ragna rǫc*

D1

Haustl 5:7	*ósvífrandi* ása
Hym 38:3	*goðmálugra*
Sindr 5:7	*salbrigðandi* Sveigðis
HH I, 29:7	*stagstiórnmǫrom*

D2

GSúrs 14:7	*veðrs Skjǫldunga* valdi
HH II, 51:3	*dís sciǫldunga*
Hym 17:7	*briótr berg-Dana*

A2k

Gldr 7:3	*svartskyggð bitu* seggi
Rm 16:5	*seglvigg ero*
Vsp 37:7	*biǫrsalr iǫtuns*
Od 29:9	*kynrícr konungr*

A2k Verbal

C

Rdr 10:5	*es þrymregin* þremja
Vsp 21:3	*er Gullveigo*
Þmáhl 6:7	*þaut andvaka* unda

E4 Verbal

Eg lv 7:6	*rann eldr of sjǫt* manna
Vsp 57:2	*sígr fold í mar*
Vell 4:2	*flestr rœðr við son* Bestlu
Hym 38:2	*hverr kann um þat*
Hfr III, 27:6	*skalmǫld hefr því* valdit
HH II, 42:8	*dǫglingr bað þic*

D1

Eg lv 26:6	*áttgǫfguðum* hattar
Gðr II, 30:2	*ættgǫfgastan*
Þmáhl 12:4	*auðvarpaðar* dauða
HH II, 27:6	*grimmúðgastan*

D2

Rdr 2:4	*mǫgr Sigvarðar* Hǫgna
Vsp 1:4	*mǫgo Heimdalar*

A2k

Hfr III, 13:6	*alldýrr konungr* stýri
HHj 10:2	*heilráðr konungr*
Hfr III,19:4	*flugstyggs sonar* Tryggva
HH II, 25:8	*Granmars sona*

A2k Verbal

Jór 1:2	*beið herr konungs* reiði
Grp 17:8	*lifðu heill, konungr*

</div>

Vsp 27:1	*veit hon Heimdalar*			
Vell 26:3	*und sigrrunni* svinnum			
Vsp 27:3	*undir heiðvǫnom*			

A1¹
Rdr 15:3	*ægir ǫflug*barða
Hym 14:3	*gýgiar græti*
Rdr 10:1	*letrat lýða* stillir
Vsp 59:5	*falla forsar*

A1
Rdr 7:2	*flotna randar* botni
Vsp 4:8	*grænom lauki*

A2¹
VGl 4:1	*eigi sofnak* Ófnir
Vsp 7:7	*tangir scópo*
Vsp 20:11	*alda bornom*

A3¹
Haustl 10:1	*urðut brattra* borða
Vsp 7:1	*hittuz æsir*

A1²
Rdr 8:7	*bar til byrjar* drǫsla
Hym 27:7	*bar hann til bæiar*
Rdr 16:1	*vaðr lá Viðris* arfa
Vsp 3:1	*ár var alda*
Rdr 11:7	*reiðr at Reifnis* skeiði
Vsp 55:7	*hiǫr til hiarta*

A2²
Rdr 3:4	*draum í sverða* flaumi
Vsp 8:4	*vant ór gulli*

A2²
Vsp 37:3	salr ór gulli
Vsp 43:1	gól um ásom
Vsp 51:1	kióll ferr austan

A3²
Korm lv 64:3	*bark með dýrum* drengjum
Vsp 56:5	*drepr hann af móði*
Haustl 18:5	*þar hné grundar* gilja
Vsp 64:5	*þar scolo dyggvar*
Rdr 13:3	*svát af renni*rauknum
Vsp 59:7	*sá er á fialli*.

The main differences between the fillers of *dróttkvætt* and *fornyrðislag* can be summarized as follows:

(1) Owing to restrictions imposed by alliteration in position 5, odd *dróttkvætt* lines have

      (a) no nominal filler in positions 3, 3-4 in Types E3-4, E3-4 Verbal, A2k, A2^1:

E3	HHj 35:7	Sigrlinnar sonr
E3 V	Fm 41:3	fram vísa scǫp
E4	HHj 43:3	Rógheims á vit
E4 V	HH I, 2:1	nótt varð í bœ
A2k	Vsp 37:7	biǫrsalr iǫtuns
A2^1	Vsp 20:11	alda bornom;

      (b) no lines of Type A2^2:

A2^2	Vsp 37:3	salr ór gulli
	Vsp 43:1	gól um ásom
	Vsp 51:1	kióll ferr austan;

      (c) a scarcity of Type D2 and inverted *kenningar*:

D2	HH II, 51:3	dís sciǫldunga
	Hym 17:7	briótr berg-Dana.

(2) Conversely, there are no odd *fornyrðislag* lines of Types XE3-4 with alliteration in positions 4 and 5, except such irregular lines as the following:

XE3	Rm 11:3	ef þú getrað son
	Hfr V, 19:5	ef næðak Sif slœðu
XE4	Gǫr I, 26:1	þá er við í hǫll
	GSúrs 3:5	þás vér í sal sátum.

(3) Odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines with a proclitic syllable in position 4 (Types A3-5) have no correspondents in eddic *fornyrðislag*, but, as was shown in Chapter 6, the filler of positions 4-6 in *dróttkvætt* lines corresponds to that of positions 1-4 in *fornyrðislag*:

Vsp 8:4	*vant ór gulli*
Hym 18:6	*sveif til scógar*
Hildr 1:2	nú rekið gand ór landi

Rdr 9:2	Bœtiþrúðr at móti
Rdr 19:4	mœrar skar fyr Þóri
Vsp 20:8	*Sculd ina þriðio*
Hfr III, 3:8	siðr / ok jarl enn þriðja
Rdr 17:2	brautar þvengr enn ljóti
Eg lv 33:4	Atli framm enn skammi
Vsp 26:6	*orð oc sœri*
HolmgB 10:6	Loptr hné Alfr ok Skopti
Haustl 1:8	Hildar fats ok Þjaza
Þjsk IV, 5:4	svarri báts ok knarrar
Vsp 27:2	*hlióð um fólgit*
Haustl 8:6	þungr vas Loptr of sprunginn
Rdr 14:4	jarðar reist of freista
Rdr 10:8	hringa þeir of fingi
HH I, 10:2	*vígs at bíða*
HolmgB 4:4	angr / á holm at ganga
Skall 2:2	ísarns meiðr at rísa
Hfr V, 10:8	niðjum Krist at biðja
Vsp 18:6	*óð gaf Hœnir*
TE 4:6	þeir / áðr mik hafi felldan
Hym 30:4	*eitt, er vissi*
Eg lv 39:6	esat þeir tolf / es skelfi
Rdr 13:6	ennitungl / þars gingu
Korm lv 37:8	sakna mank / ef vaknak.

(4) Perhaps owing to the fact that even B- and C-lines could not participate in enjambment, there are no such even lines in regular *dróttkvætt*.

(5) There are no odd and even *dróttkvætt* lines of Type E3, with an enclitic preposition in position 4 (Vsp 38:3 *Nástrǫndo á*, HH I, 13:2 *hiǫrstefno til*). The reason appears to be that the close connection between positions 4 and 5 in *dróttkvætt* would redefine the preposition in position 4 as proclitic, thus occurring in an ×-position rather than an ×̆-position.

The correspondences between the syntactic fillers of *dróttkvætt* and *fornyrðislag* lines are too striking to be fortuitous and have led earlier scholars to regard *dróttkvætt* lines as extensions of eddic *fornyrðislag* plus the two syllables in the cadence (Sievers 1893:99; Heusler 1956:300), but no one has so far been able to show how that symbiosis could have taken place. Kuhn believed that *dróttkvætt*, as well as *kviðuháttr* and *runhent*, evolved from alliterative poetry (1969a:211), but, although he regarded Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa" as an intermediate between *dróttkvætt* and alliterative poetry (Kuhn 1983:279), he did not explore that

connection further.[5] In the following section, I examine the structure of *fornyrðislag* and *dróttkvætt* more closely and suggest how hexasyllabic *dróttkvætt* could have evolved from tetrasyllabic *fornyrðislag* lines.

We have seen that the main structuring principle in *dróttkvætt* was enjambment and that Bragi's poetry in particular contains a high percentage of carried-over lines. Eddic *fornyrðislag* was also characterized by enjambment between odd and even lines, and, as in *dróttkvætt*, enjambment was subject to certain restrictions. Whereas enjambment on nominal phrases across the metrical caesura was common in Types B, C, and A3, there is a marked lack of direct connection in Types E3-4, D1-2, A2k, A2, that is, those types of fillers which are extremely rare in odd *dróttkvætt* lines. Consider the following examples:

B	Vsp 60:7-8	oc á *Fimbultýs* ‖ *fornar* (rúnar)
	HH I, 3:7-8	oc und *mána sal* ‖ *miðian* (festo)
	HH II, 18:3-4	né *illan hug* ‖ *ættar* (þinnar)
	Sg 36:7-8	oc *engi hlut* ‖ *auðins* (fiár)
	Sg 38:7-8	né ec *annars mannz* ‖ *aura* (vildac)
C	Vsp 27:3-4	undir *heiðvǫnom* ‖ *helgom* (baðmi)
	Vsp 60:3-4	oc um *moldþinur* ‖ *mátcan* (dœma)
	Vsp 62:1-2	muno *ósánir* ‖ *acrar* (vaxa)
	HH I, 26:3-4	at *mildinga* ‖ *mengi* (vakþi)
	HH II, 13:5-6	oc *úrsvalar* ‖ *unnir* (léco)
A3[1]	Þrk 12:1-2	ganga þeir *fagra* ‖ *Freyio* (at hitta)
	HH I, 48:7-8	hugði hann *íóreið* ‖ *ættar* (sinnar)
	Od 30:7-8	vilda ec *fylkis* ‖ *fiǫrvi* (biarga)
A3[2]	Vsp 4:3-4	þeir er *miðgarð* ‖ *mœran* (scópo)
	Vsp 64:5-6	þar scolo *dyggvar* ‖ *dróttir* (byggia)
	Hym 30:1-2	unz þat in *fríða* ‖ *frilla* (kendi)
	HHj 41:3-4	ef þú vill *míno* ‖ *máli* (hlýða)
	HH II, 31:1-2	þic scyli *allir* ‖ *eiðar* (bíta).

There are no *fornyrðislag* lines of Types E3-4 with nominal enjambment across the metrical caesura, except when the enjambment involves the sequence "nonalliterating demonstrative plus alliterating pronoun," which was prohibited in *dróttkvætt* (HH I, 7:1-2 *drótt þótti sá* ‖ *dǫglingr vera*). If the word in position 4 is a verb, however, direct connection is possible, as in HH I, 42:3-4 *gullbitluð, vart* ‖ *gor til rásar*. The structure of such E3-lines corresponds to that of odd sentence-introductory *dróttkvætt* lines of Type E3 (e.g., Korm lv 9:1 *léttfœran skalt láta*), in which the finite verb occupies position 4. That is also the case in *fornyrðislag* lines

of Type E4, in which a verb in position 4 can form a syntactic unit with an alliterating nomen in initial position in the following even line: HHj 39:3-4 *buðlungr, sá er var* ‖ *baztr und sólo* (cf. Eg I, 1:5 *Aðalsteinn of vann annat*). Because of restrictions imposed by alliteration, Types D2, A2k, and E3 Verbal in *fornyrðislag* display the same inverted character as *dróttkvætt* lines, and direct connection across the metrical caesura is avoided. The following examples illustrate that point:

D2	HH II, 44:9-10	*hendr* úrsvalar ‖ *Hǫgna* (mági)
	Rdr 5:3	*segls* naglfara *siglur*
A2k	Fm 35:3-4	*ástráð* mikit ‖ *yðvar* (systra)
	EVald 1:3	*hornstraum* getum *Hrímnis*
E3 V	Gðr I, 17:3-4	*ycrar* vissa ec ‖ *ástir* (mestar)
	Korm lv 47:3	*Týr* sýndisk mér *taura*.

We can conclude, then, that the direct connections between odd and even lines in *fornyrðislag* were subject to the same rules as the connections between positions 4 and 5-6 in *dróttkvætt*, that is, enjambment on two alliterating nomina in Types C and A3 was frequent; it was avoided in Types E3-4, D1-2, A2k, and A2, but allowed if the word in position 4 was a verb (Types E3-4); and inverted constructions occur in Types D2, A2k, and E3 Verbal.

Despite Kuhn's contentions to the contrary, our examination of the types of syntactic fillers in *dróttkvætt* lines has shown that, when possible, the word in the cadence forms a syntactic unit with the word directly preceding it (exceptions are Types E3-4 Verbal). The clause arrangements of the earliest *dróttkvætt* poetry ("Ragnarsdrápa") are characterized by sequence and one-clause patterns (in keeping with eddic style), by a very high percentage of lines with enjambment, as well as by such features as even C-lines and a lack of odd sentence-introductory lines of Types A2k, E3, E4 which also characterizes eddic *fornyrðislag*. I would like to suggest then, that tetrasyllabic alliterative lines with enjambment served as a model for hexasyllabic *dróttkvætt*, and that this penchant for enjambment was taken over by *dróttkvætt* and is manifested in the high percentage of enjambed lines in the poetry of the earliest skalds.

The main problem with such a genesis is that we have no way of knowing whether, at the time when *dróttkvætt* emerged as a poetic genre, there existed a syllable-counting version of eddic *fornyrðislag*. In his "Háttatal," Snorri gives an example of a tetrasyllabic alliterative meter called *balkarlag*, which he compares to *dróttkvætt* minus the cadence: "en í bálkar-lagi standast stuðlar ok höfuðstafr sem í dróttkvæðu" ('and in *balkarlag* the alliterating staves and the main stave have the same placement as in *dróttkvætt*'; *SnE* I:712; cf. Sievers 1893:116; Heusler

1956:226). When two final syllables (with internal rhyme) are added to the lines of that meter, it corresponds in its entirety to skaldic *dróttkvætt*, as is shown in the following example (*SnE* I:712):

Ht 97

> Lypta ek ljósu [hvapta]
> lofi þjóðkonungs [hljóðum]
> upp er fyr ýta [kappa]
> jarls mærð borin [snarla];
> hver muni heyra [gǫrla]
> hróðr gjǫfláta [Fróða]
> seggr svá kveðinn [beggja]
> seims ok hnossa [beima].

Such a regular tetrasyllabic variant of *fornyrðislag* is attested nowhere, and it could have been an Snorri's invention: whereas Snorri apparently divides the traditional *fornyrðislag* into four categories (Ht 96 [*fornyrðalag*], 97 [*balkarlag*], 98 [*Starkaðarlag*], and the "absent" *stikkalag*), his nephew Óláfr uses the term *balkarlag* to designate a half-stanza that does not display the same regularities of alliteration as Snorri's model stanza (*SnE* II:104), and that is also the case in the two stanzas given by Rǫgnvaldr kali in his "Háttalykill" (*Skj* IA:519; cf. Heusler 1956:226), in which the main stave is not fixed in initial position. It is doubtful then, whether Snorri's *balkarlag* reflects an early syllable-counting form of *fornyrðislag* which could have served as a model for *dróttkvætt*.

A syllable-counting meter other than *dróttkvætt* did evolve in Norse territory during the ninth century, namely *kviðuháttr*, and it first appears in Þjóðólfr's "Ynglingatal" (*Skj* IA:7-15). That meter is characterized by three syllables in odd lines and four syllables in even lines, as well as by *kenningar*, and scholars agree that it evolved from *fornyrðislag* with abbreviated versions of odd lines and the even lines kept intact (Sievers 1893:117; Heusler 1956:203; Kuhn 1983:336).[6] Consider the following stanza from "Ynglingatal" (*Skj* IA:7):

Yt 1

varð framgengt	C
þars Fróði bjó	B
feigðar orð	A2
es at Fjǫlni kom	B
ok sikling	C
svigðis geira	A
vágr vindlauss	D2
of viða skyldi.	C

As Elias Wessén has pointed out, the meter (and subject matter) of "Ynglingatal" shows clear correspondences with the stanza about Þiðrikr af Bern

on the Swedish Rök stone (around 850; Wessén 1964:10, see also von Friesen 1920:49). Compare the following stanzas (Wessén 1958:25; Yt 35:5-8, 36:5-8):[7]

Rök	reð ÞioðrikR
	hinn þurmoði
	stilliR flutna
	strandu HraiðmaraR
	sitiR nu garuR
	a guta sinum
	skialdi umb fatlaðR
	skati Mæringa.

Yt 35:5-8	réð Áleifr
	ofsa forðum
	víðri grund
	of Vestmari.

Yt 36:5-8	nú liggr gunndjarfr
	á Geirstǫðum
	herkonungr
	haugi ausinn.

In the Rök-stanza, lines 1 and 5 have the fillers of odd *kviðuháttr* lines (normalized: *réð Þjóðrekr*; *sitr nú gǫrr*, with syncope), whereas lines 3 and 7 (normalized: *stillir flotna* [A²], *skjaldi of fatlaðr*, A² with elision), as well as the even lines (normalized: *enn þormóði* [?] [C], *strǫnd Hreiðmarar*, D2 with apocope, *á gota sínum* [C], *skati Mæringa*, D2 with resolution), correspond to tetrasyllabic *fornyrðislag*. This stanza, then, which still contains uncontracted forms (*garuR*, *strandu*), is a hybrid between syllable-counting *kviðuháttr* and *fornyrðislag*, and it is possible that a similar (Swedish?) genealogical poem could have served as a model for Þjóðólfr's "Ynglingatal" and prompted the formation of *kviðuháttr*.

Thus the seeds of syllable-counting alliterative poetry were indeed present in Norse territory in the ninth century, and it is likely that both *kviðuháttr* and *dróttkvætt* are end products of a process that started early in that century, and that both meters developed indigenously within the alliterative tradition; *kviðuháttr* by a stylization of patterns already present and *dróttkvætt* by the addition of two extra syllables, probably prompted by enjambment. *Dróttkvætt* lines of Type A⁵, have no correspondence in eddic *fornyrðislag* and are structurally similar to odd *kviðuháttr* lines like Yt 1:3 *feigðar orð*, Yt 2:7 *Dusla konr*, Yt 5:11 *Svía kind*, Yt 6:3 *fróða menn* plus a proclitic and the cadence (e.g., *feigðar orð* [*of færði*], *Dusla konr* [*ok dundi*], *Svía kind* [*at sandi*]). It is therefore not impossible that such trisyllabic forms could have served as a model for this type of *dróttkvætt* line.

We have also seen that suspended nominal phrases in the third line of the *helmingr* occur in both *fornyrðislag* and in Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa." As the following examples show, these constructions are very common in *kviðuháttr*, too, and they could be remnants of a common tradition (the orthography of the Rök-stanza has been normalized):

<div style="margin-left:2em">

Vsp 1:5-8

> vildo, at ec, Valfǫðr,
> vel fyrtelia
> **forn spiǫll fira,**
> þau er fremst um man.

Yt 2:5-8

> þás í stein
> enn stórgeði
> **Dusla konr**
> ept dvergi hljóp.

Rök 1-4

> réð Þjóðrekr
> enn þormóði
> **stillir flotna**
> strǫnd Hreiðmarar.

Rdr 15

> hamri fórsk í hœgri
> hǫnd / þás allra landa
> **œgir ǫflugbarða**
> endiseiðs of kenndi.

</div>

We must conclude then that there existed a tradition of syllable-counting poetry in early ninth-century Scandinavia. That type of poetry must have been established after the first period of syncope and apocope, and it is not unlikely that syllable counting as a poetic device could have originated in the sound changes that swept across Scandinavia in the eighth century (see Lehmann 1956:190). Certain noncontracted forms are still found in the Rök-stanza, but in the earliest poems in *kviðuháttr* and *dróttkvætt*, those changes have already been completed. We know nothing about the poetic traditions of the Norse people prior to the syncope period, but, as Heusler convincingly showed, the attempt to press reconstructed nonsyncopated forms into the extant alliterative framework is futile.[8]

Kenningar also occur in *kviðuháttr* and they are based on the same principles as in *dróttkvætt*. However, they are structurally simpler and, owing to the tri- and tetrasyllabic lines, the individual elements are shorter (e.g., *vindlauss vágr svigðis geira* 'the windless wave of the steer's spears' ["mead"]; *meinþjófr markar* 'the harmful thief of the forest,' *glymjandi glóða garmr* 'the roaring hound of embers,' *dynjandi bani Hálfs* 'the resounding bane of Hálfr' ["fire"]). The structure of

dróttkvætt clearly lends itself to longer, nominal constructions that often serve as a tool to fulfill metrical requirements. However, the elaborate *kenningar* in "Ragnarsdrápa" and "Haustlǫng" are certainly not experimental, but presuppose a long tradition. Where they came from is impossible to ascertain.

With respect to the internal rhymes, the Irish rhymes are too different to serve as a model. In *fornyrðislag*, internal rhymes do not appear to be have been used consciously as a poetic device, but a look at Þjóðólfr's "Ynglingatal" reveals a surprisingly high percentage of lines with internal rhymes (both *aðalhendingar* and *skothendingar*) that are carried across the metrical caesura, as in the following examples:

Yt 30:9-12	ok sk*æ*rei*ð* ‖ *í* Sk*í*ringssal
	of br*yn*jalfs ‖ b*ein*um drúpir.

Yt 31	enn *Ey*steinn ‖ fyr *ás*i fór
	til Býleists ‖ bróður m*ey*jar
	ok nú l*igg*r ‖ und l*ag*ar beinum
	rekks lǫðu*ð*r ‖ á ra*ð*ar broddi
	þars élkaldr ‖ hjá jǫfur gauzkum
	Vǫðlu str*aumr* ‖ at vági k*ømr*.

The placement of these rhymes is not systematic, and they can occur in initial and final position (e.g., Yt 18:5-6 *enn skíðlauss* ‖ *Skilfinga nið*, Yt 22:7-8 *Ála dolgr* ‖ *at Uppsǫlum*), in initial position (e.g., Yt 7:11-12 *Loka mær* ‖ *of leikinn hefr*, Yt 25:11-12 *Gymis ljóð* ‖ *at gamni kveðr*), in final position (e.g., Yt 11:11-12 *Freys afspring* ‖ *í folk hafa*, Yt 34:3-4 *Ásu árr* ‖ *af jǫfri bar*), and in final and initial position (e.g., Yt 23:3-4 *lokins lífs* ‖ *á Lófundi*, Yt 35:5-6 *réð Áleifr* ‖ *ofsa forðum*). There is a strong tendency for such rhymes to occur clause initially and clause finally. It is of course possible that the internal rhymes in "Ynglingatal" derive from the influence of *dróttkvætt* and that Þjóðólfr, when composing his genealogical poem, subconsciously chose words that would enable him to achieve a similar effect as in *dróttkvætt*. A look at the poem on the Swedish Rök stone, however, shows that this stanza, too, contains internal rhymes (see Vogt 1937-38: 229):

Rök	réð Þj*óð*rekr ‖ enn þorm*óð*i
	stillir flotna ‖ strǫnd Hr*eið*marar
	s*it*r nú gǫrr ‖ á g*ot*a sínum
	skjaldi um fa*t*laðr ‖ sk*at*i Mæringa.

It is difficult to believe that these rhymes were coincidental; rather, it is likely that the early poets were aware of the effect created by syllables with similar

consonantal environment and that they used such syllables consciously as an additional (and optional) poetic adornment. In *dróttkvætt*, this device was stylized and became part of the formal requirements. Bragi's "Ragnarsdrápa," which contains lines without internal rhyme (e.g., Rdr 1:1 *vilið Hrafnketill heyra*, Rdr 1:3 *Þrúðar skalk ok þengil*), even lines with imperfect rhymes (e.g., Rdr 1:4 *þjófs iljablað leyfa*), lines with internal rhymes in positions 1 and 3 (e.g., Rdr 5:7 *hǫrðum herðimýlum*, Rdr 8:7 *bar til byrjar drǫsla*), and rhymes across the metrical caesura (e.g., Rdr 12:1-2 *þá má sókn á Svǫlnis* ‖ *salpenningi kenna*), reflects a transitional stage in that process.

The same forces that prompted the radical sound changes in the seventh and eighth centuries, namely a "continued presence of *initial stress* as a 'forward peak of energy'" that "tended to concentrate attention on the information value of the first syllable" (Haugen 1976:151), were most likely responsible for the evolution of syllable-counting meters as well as internal rhymes, and there is no need seek foreign models for the formal features that characterize Old Norse *dróttkvætt*.[9]

The Demise of Dróttkvætt

During the latter part of the thirteenth century and the fourteenth century, *dróttkvætt* meter was ousted by other and less intricate meters (notably *hrynhent*, meters with end rhyme, and *rímur*) and finally disappeared. We have no evidence that *dróttkvætt* ever prospered in Sweden, and in Denmark there is some evidence suggesting that it probably went out of fashion much earlier. As early as the eleventh century we find the derogatory comments by Sneglu-Halli about the state of affairs in Denmark ("verðrat drápa með Dǫnum verri" 'no poem could be worse among the Danes'; *ÍF* 9:292-93), and Kuhn detects certain metrical violations (the sequence of three short syllables) that seem to have been connected with poetry composed at the Danish court. These circumstances lead him to speculate that the great quantity shift could have left traces in Danish territory as early as the twelfth century (Kuhn 1939:205-06).

Saxo Grammaticus, writing around 1200, describes how the Danes were entertained by a "singer" (*cantor*), who performed a German version of Grimhild's revenge for her brothers to warn Duke Knútr of impending treason, and Saxo explicitly states that Knútr was a great admirer of German entertainment and customs ("tunc cantor, quod Kanutum Saxonici et ritus et nominis amantissimum scisset," *Gesta danorum*, p. 355). An episode in *Knýtlinga saga* also indicates that the twelfth-century Danish court favored continental entertainment rather than skaldic *dróttkvætt*. According to that saga, the Icelandic skald Einarr Skúlason embarked on a journey to the Danish court with a praise poem for King Sveinn. Sveinn, however, preferred the more mundane artistry of the jongleur Rípaúlfr to Einarr's eulogy and failed to reward him for his poetic efforts, upon which the

dismayed Einarr vented his anger with the following *dróttkvætt* stanza (*ÍF* 35:275; *Skj* IA:483):

ESk XIII, 3   ekki hlaut af ítrum
        Einarr gjafa Sveini
        ǫld lofar ǫðlings mildi
        æðru styggs fyr kvæði;
        danskr harri metr dýrra
        dugir miðlung þat fiðlur
        ræðr fyr ræsis auði
        Rípaúlfr ok pípur.

(Einarr received no reward for his poem from the illustrious Sveinn; people praise the generosity of the fearless prince; the Danish lord values fiddles and whistles more highly; that is not very good; Rípaúlfr controls the chieftain's wealth.)

It is safe to assume then, that, whatever popularity the West-Norse skaldic tradition might have enjoyed in Denmark, by the twelfth century the Danes had embraced other types of entertainment and were no longer receptive to the subtleties of *dróttkvætt* poetry.

Lausavísur and encomiastic poems in honor of Icelandic bishops, chieftains, and Norwegian dignitaries continued to be composed in Iceland during the thirteenth century, but from the scanty production we must conclude that the composition of *dróttkvætt* poetry was no longer a flourishing trade (see *Skj* IIA:1-344). Around 1220, Snorri Sturluson compiled the Prose Edda, which contains elaborate explanations that were designed to elucidate the obscure mythological *kenningar* ("Gylfaginning" and "Skaldskaparmál"; cf. Clunies Ross 1987) as well as the metrical peculiarities of *dróttkvætt* and its variant meters ("Háttatal"). Snorri's efforts were both explanatory and didactic, and he aimed to reintroduce the intricacies of the skaldic tradition to aspiring poets and to an audience that had increasingly lost touch with that practice.

However, there is reason to believe that Snorri's attempt to reawaken interest in the composition and understanding of the old *dróttkvætt* was not solely rooted in his antiquarian curiosity. An accomplished skald, he went to Norway with panegyrics he had composed in honor of Norwegian royalty, with whom he tried to form political alliances. The model stanzas in his "Háttatal" were dedicated to the young Norwegian king Hákon and Hákon's uncle and regent, Earl Skúli. Snorri's later sagas on the history of the Norwegian kings ("Heimskringla," from around 1230) were studded with skaldic stanzas that served as an authority for the historical events described in the prose. Under these circumstances, it is possible that Snorri, fueled by political ambition, was prompted to compose his poetic

exegeses by the desire to credit his own poetic production, that is, the tool by which he, in the spirit of ancient Icelandic court poets, hoped to gain allies and reward at the Norwegian court.

However that may be, there is evidence that his efforts (both poetic and political) were not crowned with success. By the end of the thirteenth century, the number of *dróttkvætt* stanzas had dropped dramatically, and, in the fourteenth century, skaldic composition in *dróttkvætt* meter was almost entirely a practice of Icelandic clerics whose poetry usually revolved around religious themes (see *Skj* IIA). If we look at the diplomatic edition of ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* poems (*Skj* IA) contained in late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century manuscripts, it becomes increasingly clear that the scribes who committed these stanzas to parchment often had very little idea about their content. Despite Snorri's efforts, the intricate mythological *kenningar* of the early poetry were no longer transparent, and we find corruptions of *kenningar* and parts of *kenningar*, as in the following stanzas from "Haustlǫng" (from the Codex Regius of the Prose Edda, around 1300; *Skj* IA:17):

Haustl 4, 1-4	Fiallgylþir bað fvlla*n*
	feta mela
	hl*v*t af helgo skvtli
	hrafn asar vin blasa.
	fjallgylðir bað fyllar
	Fetmeila sér deila
	hlaut af helgu skutli
	hrafnásar vinr blása.
Haustl 5:5-8	e*n* af breiðo bioðe
	bragðviss at þ*at* lagðe
	osvifr*a*nde asa
	vp þior hlifi ora.
	en af breiðu bjóði
	bragðvíss at þat lagði
	ósvífrandi ása
	upp tjórhluti fjóra.

More important, the stereotyped patterns of interchange between long and short syllables apparently collapsed, and we find insertions of personal pronouns to simplify the syntax (*hann*, etc.), which result in superfluous syllables:

Korm lv 14:5	vita s*kal* hitt ef *h*ann hætt*ir*	(*Skj* IA:82)
GSúrs 9:7	svo rak hon sniallra bræþra	(*Skj* IA:103)
Hfr II, 13:7	hvars *h*ann scríðr með liþ lyða	(*Skj* IA:162).

The encliticized subject *-k* is regularly spelled out except in line-final position (e.g., GSúrs 13:1 *Felld kom ek inn þars eldar*; *Skj* IA:103), and that is in general also the rule with other contractions, such as *-s* and the enclitic *-t* (< *þú*; e.g., Haustl 7:3 *sa er avll regin eygia*, Korm lv 12:1 *huat skaltu orua ali*, Korm lv 9:1 *lettfæran skaltu láta*, *Skj* IA:17, 82). Sometimes such insertions lead to hypercorrections and the deletion of other elements, and in some manuscripts Hfr III, 3:7 *frægrs til slíks at segja*, Sindr 12:2 *þeim stýrðu goð Beima*, and Hfr V, 18:2 *kveðk enn of hlut þenna* are rendered as follows:

Hfr III, 3:7	frǫgr *e*r ti*l* slics at segia	
(variant:	frægr er slikt at segia);	(*Skj* IA:160)
Sindr 12:2	þ*eim* er styrþv beima	(*Skj* IA:78)
Hfr V, 18:2	kueð ec v*m* hlut þenna	(*Skj* IA:171).

The enclitic negation *-a(t)* was replaced by *eigi* and, conversely, *eigi* was replaced by *ei*, thus upsetting the syllabic schemes, as the following examples show:

Eg lv 43:7	matti e*igi* bauls of bi*nn*daz	(< *máttit*; *Skj* IA:59)
Eyv lv 10:4	bið ec e*igi* m*er* ens þriðia	(< *biðkat*; *Skj* IA:73)
HolmgB 2:7	villdi e*igi* fra*mm* af felldi	(< *vildit*; *Skj* IA:92)
Hfr III, 20:1	Veít ec e*igi* hitt aðr heita	(< *veitkat*: variants: *æi* / *ei*; *Skj* IA:163-64)
Hfr III, 24:7	ka*n* ec e*igi* mart at m*a*nna	(< *kannkat*: variant: *ei*; *Skj* IA:165).

Evidence of instability in the syllabic sequences occurs as early as Snorri's "Háttatal." The section on "syllables that are pronounced quickly" ("samstöfur skjótar," i.e., resolution, neutralization, and contraction; *SnE* I:608-10) is prefaced by a section on "syllables that are pronounced slowly." Snorri writes (*SnE* I:608): "ok megu finnast svâ seinar, at fimm samstöfur sè í öðru ok enu fjórða vísuorði" (and some may be so slow that there are five syllables in the second and the fourth line). The examples he gives are all even D2-lines, with disyllabic rather than trisyllabic compounds in positions 2-4. Consider the following examples; the orthography has been normalized):

Ht 7:2	hvatr Vindhlæs skatna
Ht 7:4	hræs þjóðár ræsa
Ht 7:6	ǫld dreyrfá skjǫldu
Ht 7:8	sterkr jarngrá serki.

The final elements in three of these compounds are apocopated or syncopated forms of older disyllabic forms (*þjóðáar*, *dreyrfáa*, *jarngráa*), but the fourth is not (*Vindhlæs*); compare the following lines from ninth- and tenth-century *dróttkvætt* (cf. Kuhn 1983:70; Kristján Árnason 1991:90):

Korm lv 18:8	linns þjóðáar rinna
Rdr 3:3	með dreyrfáar dróttir
GSúrs 22:2	Saumhlǫkk gráum blakki.

Early *dróttkvætt* contains a high number of such hiatus words, and, as the examples below show, they are especially prominent in positions 3-4, Types D2 and A2k:

Kveld 1:8	hugr / Malmgnáar brugðit
Vell 37:4	hjarl sextían jarla
Eg lv 19:4	ráns míns féar hánum
Korm lv 18:8	linns þjóðáar rinna
Eg lv 4:8	regnbjóðr / Háars þegna
Eyv lv 9:2	fallsól bráa vallar
Korm lv 29:4	hornungr / tváa morna
Korm lv 60:8	Aurreks / náar gauri
GSúrs 8:4	gunnbliks / þáamiklu.

Snorri's commentary clearly demonstrates that, by the thirteenth century, these disyllabic forms had been monophthongized and that, to retain the meter, they were pronounced "slowly." Similar evidence can be gleaned from the manuscripts, in which such disyllabic forms are invariably rendered as monosyllables: *malmgnár* (variants; *maglunar, mal braar; Skj* I A:29), *xvi* (variant: *sextan; Skj* IA:131), *fiar* (i.e., *fjár; Skj* IA:53), *þjóðár* (*Skj* IA:83), *háars* (variants: *hars, härs; Skj* IA:49), *blá* (variants: *-bra, bra, braar; Skj* IA:73), *tua* (*Skj* IA:85), *nærr* (*Skj* IA:90), *þá miklu* (*Skj* IA:102: see also GSúrs 22:2 *grám; Skj* IA:106, and Rdr 3:3 *dreyrfar; Skj* IA: 1, above).

Earlier forms of compounds that were long by means of a *-j-/-v-* infix lose these infixes and are rendered as the prohibited sequence of three consecutive short syllables, as in the following examples:

Rdr 13:7	fyr vinjeyjar víðri	(*víneyiar*; variant: *vinæyia; Skj* IA:3)
Eg lv 15:3	í niðjerfi Narfa	(*nid erfi*; variants: *niðerni, niⁱ erfⁱ*; *Skj* IA:52)
Eyv lv 14:6	við mævǫrum sævar	(*mæ ǫrvm; Skj* IA:74)
Rdr 2:4	mǫgr Sigvarðar Hǫgna	(*sigvrþar*; variant: *sigrvnar; Skj* IA:1)
Korm I, 2:4	hjarls Sigvarði jarli	(*sigvrþi; Skj* IA:79)
Gráf 8:2	hrynjeld at þat brynju	(*hryneld*; variants: *rynielld, rynielldar, hrynelldr, hrynælldr; Skj* IA:77).

We see then that, by the middle of the thirteenth century, the delicate syllabic balance on which *dróttkvætt* was founded was upset. Around that time another sound change took place that confused the issue further, namely the desyllabification of final *-r*. Traces of that change can be found in Icelandic before 1300 (Jón Þorkelsson 1863), and it is evidenced in the orthography of such manuscripts as the *Hauksbók* version of *Landnámabók* (ca. 1300), as the following two *lausavísur* by Hrómundr halti and Þórbjǫrn þyna show (*Skj* IA:96):

<div style="padding-left:2em">

Hróm 1:5-8   sva gol fyʀ þa er feiger
folk narungar varu
gvnnar haukur er gaukar
Gautz bragda spa saugdu.

svá gól fyrr þás feigir
folknárungar váru
Gunnar haukr es gaukar
Gauts bragða spá sǫgðu.

Þþyn 1:1   Laackar hagli stockinn
hræs er kemur af sævi
modr krefr morgin bradar
mar valkastar baru
sva göl endur þa er vnda
eids a fornvm meidi
hræfa Gaukur þa er Haukar
hilldingar miod villdu.

hlakkar hagli stokkinn
hræs es kømr at sævi
móðr krefr morginbráðar
már valkastar báru
svá gól endr þás unda
eiðs af fornum meiði
hræva gaukr es haukar
hildinga mjǫð vildu.

</div>

These two stanzas demonstrate the lack of contraction (*þás* > *þá er*) as well as the epenthetic *-u-* (*haukur, kemur, endur, gaukur*) that added additional syllables to the hexasyllabic *dróttkvætt* line and caused an upheaval in the sequences of long and short syllables (an increase in the number of syllables in an ×-position). Other sound changes that took place during this period also contributed to a change in the phonetic inventory, such as the diphthongization of /e/ after an initial /h/, /k/, /g/ in

words like *Heðinn*: Hfr III, 17:4 *vigþey hieðíns meyiaʀ* (*Skj* IA:163; see A. Noreen 1970:95), causing a diphthong to occupy a short position. Similarly, long nominal forms started to be used in position 4, Type E4:

Rdr 7:4	ragnaʀ *ok* fiold sagna	(<*fjǫl*; *Skj* IA:2)
Hfr III, 7:6	hnít vegg *med* fiold seggia	(<*fjǫl*; *Skj* IA:161)
GSúrs 29:6	valtafns i munn hrafni	(< *mun*; *Skj* IA:107).

The dating of the great quantity shift that caused a radical rearrangement of the Icelandic phonetic inventory is controversial. Some scholars believe that shift started as late as the sixteenth century (Kristján Árnason 1980:160; Haugen 1976:259), but others are more inclined to place its beginning in the fourteenth, maybe as early as the thirteenth century (Gade 1986b; Fix-Bonner 1990).[10] The quantity shift would have obliterated the old distinctions of syllabic length on which *dróttkvætt* was based and distorted the old patterns beyond recognition.

A look at the fourteenth-century "Pétrsdrápa" (*Skj* IIA:500-508) shows an advanced deterioration of the syllabic patterns that characterized early *dróttkvætt*. Although the number of syllables and the placement of alliteration basically follow the rules of strict *dróttkvætt*, the fixed sequences of long and short syllables no longer exist (e.g., Pét 2:2 *gleðz senn ok einn þrennum* [E4], Pét 3:2 *hrekkjǫttu jǫrð slóttig* [E3], Pét 5:3 *miskunnar ok mǫnnum* [E3]), and the requirements of alliteration which shaped the syntactic fillers of odd and even lines do not apply (e.g., Pét 2:1 *persónum guð greiniz*, Pét 3:5 *fals ágirni ok fúlust* [XE3, D2, sentence introductory]). The poet clearly attempted to achieve a trochaic rhythm and was oblivious to the fact that long syllables regularly occur in short positions, as in the following lines:

Pét 1:6	ítr guð stórt ok lítit
Pét 1:8	sonr mey guðz at deyja
Pét 3:1	hulin mín hyggju báli
Pét 3:6	flærð mik þann veg lærði
Pét 3:8	seimvín líkt hjá eimi.

Similar violations are found in other *dróttkvætt* poems from the fourteenth century, as well, and structurally these fourteenth-century stanzas bear scant resemblance to earlier *dróttkvætt*, with regard to syllabic patterns, types of syntactic fillers, and the clause function of the respective types of fillers. When the tuning fork that adjusted the phonetic sequences of *dróttkvætt* was thrown off-key, the audience, as well as the performing poets, could no longer have distinguished the fine nuances that delineated the syntax, and the premises that were crucial to the composition and comprehension of that art ceased to exist. Thus the same forces that prompted the creation of skaldic *dróttkvætt* in the ninth century (a chain of fundamental linguistic

changes) must have brought about its eventual demise almost half a millennium later.

To sum up: by the late thirteenth century, linguistic and cultural changes had precipitated the demise of *dróttkvætt*. Despite Snorri's elucidating efforts, the ancient skaldic vocabulary, the nominal circumlocutions, and the contractions (Snorri's *bragarmál*, *SnE* I:610) must have become increasingly obscure, and, furthermore, sound changes like the desyllabification of final -*r*, diphthongization of /e/, apocope and syncope, and perhaps the onset of the great quantity shift rocked the very foundations on which *dróttkvætt* was built, and the meter was replaced by the smoother *hrynhent* and *runhent*, and eventually by the popular *rímur*. The following stanza from "Guðmundardrápa," a fourteenth-century hagiographic poem in *hrynhent* meter by the Icelandic cleric Ámi Jónsson must have echoed the contemporary view that sealed the fate of a poetic tradition that had flourished in Norse territory for almost five hundred years (*Skj* IIA:429):

> Gd 78   Yfirmeisturum mun Eddu listar
> allstirður sjá hróður virðaz
> þeim er vilja svá grafa ok geyma
> grein klókasta fræðibóka;
> lofi heilagra líz mér hæfa
> ljós ritninga sætra vitni
> en kenningar auka mǫnnum
> engan styrk en fagnað myrkva.

> (This poem will seem quite unsmooth to those great masters of Edda's art who want to investigate and observe the most learned rules of the books of wisdom; to me it seems that the clear testimony of sweet writings better befits the praise of holy people; for *kenningar* do not increase people's power, but obscure the pleasure.)

NOTES

Chapter 1

1. See Lee M. Hollander 1968; Klaus von See 1967, 1980; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1976; Roberta Frank 1978; Hans Kuhn 1983. Roberta Frank (1985:157-96) gives an exhaustive overview of the state of the art of scholarship.

2. See the literature cited by Jan de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2d rev. ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1977), p. 481, and Alexander Jóhannesson, *Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke, 1956), p. 780. The Modern Icelandic form of the word is the lengthened *skáld*, but there is ample evidence from the internal rhymes of early skaldic poetry that the word originally had a short *a* (rhyming with *-ald*).

3. For a discussion of the practice of erecting such poles, see Bo Almqvist, *Norrön niddiktning: Traditionshistoriska studier i versmagi*, vol. 1: *Nid mot furstar*, Nordiska texter och undersökningar, 21 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1965), and *Norrön niddiktning: Traditionshistoriska studier i versmagi*, vol. 2, 1-2: *Nid mot missionärer: Senmedeltida nidtraditioner*, Nordiska texter och undersökningar, 23 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1974); Preben Meulengracht Sørensen, *Norrønt nid: Forestillingen om den umandige mand i de islandske sagaer* (Odense: Odense University Press, 1980); Kari Ellen Gade, "Homosexuality and Rape of Males in Old Norse Law and Literature," *SS* 58 (1986):124-41.

4. The distinction between eddic and skaldic poetry is by no means transparent. The functional criteria listed here are not always sufficient to distinguish skaldic from eddic poetry, but they serve to highlight the general differences between the two genres. See the discussions by Frank (1985:159-60) and Hermann Pálsson, "Towards a Classification of Early Icelandic Poetry," in *Atti*, pp. 59-65.

5. *Skj* IA:174-75, 24-29, 64-68. Felix Genzmer, "Das eddische Preislied," *BGDSL* 44 (1920):146-68; Klaus von See, "Studien zum Haraldskvæði," *ANF* 76 (1961):96-111 (reprinted in his *ESS*, pp. 295-310) and "Zwei eddische Preislieder: Eiríksmál und Hákonarmál," in *Festgabe für Ulrich Pretzel zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Werner Simon et al. (Berlin: Schmidt, 1963), pp. 107-17 (reprinted in his *ESS*, pp. 318-28); and Edith Marold, "Das Walhallbild in den Eiríksmál und den Hákonarmál," *MS* 5 (1972):19-33, discuss that genre.

6. The meaning of the term *drápa* is not clear. The word seems to have derived from the strong verb *drepa* (hit, beat), possibly in the meaning "to furnish with refrain" (Sigurður Nordal 1931-32:148) or referring to a heavy and well-rehearsed pattern of recitation (Rudolf Keyser, *Nordmændenes videnskabelighed og literatur i middelalderen*, Efterladte skrifter, 1 [Oslo: Malling, 1866], p.114). See also Kuhn (1983:209).

7. The genres *níðvísur* and *mansǫngr* are discussed by Folke Ström, *Níð, ergi, and Old Norse Moral Attitudes*, Dorothea Coke Memorial Lecture in Northern Studies, delivered at University College London, 10 May 1973 (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1974); Almqvist, *Norrön niddiktning*, Vols. 1-2, 1-2; Frank 1970; Meulengracht Sørensen, *Norrønt nid*; and Gade, "Homosexuality" and "Penile Puns: Personal Names and Phallic Symbols in Skaldic Poetry," in *Essays in Medieval Studies: Proceedings of the Illinois Medieval Association* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), pp. 57-67.

8. Frank 1970 and Gade, "Penile Puns," discuss onomastic play in skaldic poetry. Kuhn (1983:111-13) gives an overview of the use of personal names in *dróttkvætt*.

9. Standard works on *kenningar* include Rudolf Meissner, *Die Kenningar der Skalden: Ein Beitrag zur skaldischen Poetik*, Rheinische Beiträge und Hülfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie und Volkskunde, 1 (Bonn: Kurt Schroeder, 1921); Krause 1930; Mohr 1933; Hallvard Lie, *'Natur' og 'unatur' i skaldekunsten*, Avhandlinger utgitt av det norske videnskaps-akademi i Oslo, II, Hist.-filos. klasse, 1 (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1957); Frank 1978; and Marold 1983. See also Krömmelbein 1983; Kuhn (1983:220-32); and Clunies Ross 1987. A list of the *kenningar* occurring in eddic and skaldic poetry with translations into Modern Danish can be found in Sveinbjörn Egilsson 1966.

10. For structural and semantic definitions of the *kenning* see Meissner, *Die Kenningar*, p. 2; Arthur G. Brodeur, "The Meaning of Snorri's Categories," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, 36, no. 4 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952); Krause (1930:5); Mohr 1933; Andreas Heusler, "Review of Meissner's, *Die Kenningar der Skalden*," in his *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Helga Reuschel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1943), p. 296; Einar Ól. Sveinsson (1962:145-46); Lindow (1975:317); James Blakeman Spamer, "The Kenning and the Kend Heiti: A Contrastive Study of Periphrasis in Two Germanic Poetic Traditions" (Diss., Brown University, 1977); Frederic Amory, "Towards a Grammatical Classification of Kennings as Compounds," *ANF* 97 (1982):74; Marold (1983:24-30, 211-12); Krömmelbein (1983:17-25); Bjarne Fidjestøl, "Kenningsystemet: Forsøk på ein lingvistisk analyse," *MM* 1974, pp. 5-50, "Kenningsystemet: Gjenmæle til Peter Hallberg: Några reflexioner," *MM* 1979, pp. 27-29, and (1985:57-59, 63); Peter Hallberg, "Kenningsystemet: Några reflexioner," *MM* 1978, pp. 18-25; and Clunies Ross 1987.

11. OE: Beow 529b *bearn Ecgþeowes* 'child of Ecgþeow' (= Beowulf); Beow 1968a *bonan Ongenþeoes* 'bane of Ongenþeow' (= Higelac); Beow 1102a *beaggyfan* 'ring giver'; Beow 397a *hildebord* 'war board' (= "shield"); Beow 2617b *guðgewæda* 'battle garments.' The *kenningar* in Anglo-Saxon poetry are discussed by Wilhelm Bode, *Die Kenningar in der angelsächsischen Dichtung: Mit Ausblicken auf andere Litteraturen* (Diss., Darmstadt; Leipzig: Zernin, 1886); James W. Rankin, "A Study of the Kennings in Anglo-Saxon Poetry," *JEGP* 8 (1909):357-422, *JEGP* 9 (1910):49-84; Hendrik van der Merwe Scholtz, *The Kenning in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Poetry* (Utrecht: N. V. Dekker & Van de Vegt en J. W. Van Leeuwen, 1928); Hertha Marquardt, *Die altenglischen Kenningar: Ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung*, Schriften

der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft: Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 14, no. 3 (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1938); and Spamer, "The Kenning and the Kend Heiti."

12. Snorri's "Háttatal": *kenningar, tvíkennt, rekit* (*SnE* I:600); "Níunda [leyfi] er þat, at reka til hinnar fimtu kenníngar, en or ættum er, ef lengra er rekit; en þótt þat finnist í fornskálda verka, þá látum vær þat nú únýtt" (*SnE* I:612).

13. The words *gjǫflastr* (Sindr 4:3) and *Steingerðr* (Korm lv 57:7, most likely spurious) are the only exceptions from the ninth and tenth centuries.

14. Some of Bragi's even lines violate this rule (in the excerpted corpus: Rdr 1:2, 9:6, 9:8, 18:2; Bragi II, 3:4; see also TE 1:2, 1:6, 2:4, 2:6, 2:8, 5:6; Eg lv 1:2, 6:4, 7:2, 7:8, 38:2, 38:4, 40:2; Eyv lv 14:6; Korm lv 9:6, 17:4, 17:6, 20:6, 48:6, 52:2, 56:2, 56:4, 56:8, 61:2, 61:6, 61:8; HolmgB 3:2; GSúrs 28:6; Þjsk I, 2:2). The violations are usually contained in older poetry or in *lausavísur* of a less restricted form. According to Snorri (*SnE* I:666-68), even lines of this type contained metrical errors (*háttafǫll*), and he regarded them as peculiarities of "the ancient skalds" (*fornskǫld*).

15. Ernest Classen, *On Vowel Alliteration in the Old Germanic Languages*, University of Manchester Publications: Germanic Series, 1 (Manchester: University Press, 1913), pp. 1-35, surveys the existing theories of the origin of vowel alliteration. C. J. S. Marstrander, "Notes on Alliteration," in *Serta Eitremiana: Opuscula Philologica S. Eitrem septuagenario xxviii dec. MCMXLII oblata* (Oslo: Brøgger, 1942), p. 208, discusses the relations between Old Norse, Old Irish, and Medieval Latin alliteration and concludes that Germanic alliteration did not originate under Celtic influence, but that both Germanic and Celtic alliteration should be viewed as common inheritance. Kabell 1978 believes that Germanic alliteration developed under Celtic influence, but see the criticism by Klaus von See, "Stabreim und Endreim: Über neuere Arbeiten zur germanischen Verskunst," *BGDSL* (T) 102 (1980):399-417 (reprinted in *ESS*, pp. 406-24). See also Kuhn (1983:49-51, 61-62, 73-75) and Kristján Árnason (1991:5-8, 12-15).

16. "Ok er þat leyfi en eigi rètt setníng" (*SnE* I: 596).

17. Bernhard Kahle, *Die Sprache der Skalden auf Grund der Binnen und Endreime verbunden mit einem Rimarium* (Strassbourg: Trübner, 1892), gives a complete inventory of internal rhymes in *dróttkvætt* lines. Falk 1894 and Kristján Árnason (1987, 1991:15-17, 19-20, 96-108) discuss the postvocalic environment in *hendingar*. Finnur Jónsson, "Ulige linjer i drotkvædede skjaldekvad," *ANF* 7 (1891):309-33, lists odd *dróttkvætt* lines without internal rhyme, and Friedrich Kluge, "Zur Geschichte des Reimes im Altgermanischen," *BGDSL* 9 (1884):422-50, and Vogt (1937-38:228-62), survey occurrences of internal rhyme in Old English and Norse alliterative poetry. Kuhn (1977, 1983:75-89) and Kuhn, "Vor tausend Jahren: Zur Geschichte des skaldischen Innenreims," in *Speculum Norrænum: Norse Studies in Memory of Gabriel Turville-Petre*, ed. Ursula Dronke, et al. (Odense: Odense University Press, 1981), pp. 293-309, give an exhaustive overview of the function and nature of internal rhymes in skaldic poetry. See also Jürgen Kühnel, *Untersuchungen zum germanischen Stabreimvers*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 209 (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1978), esp. pp. 1-58, and von See, "Stabreim und Endreim," pp. 399-411.

18. The terms *skothending* (inserted rhyme) and *aðalhending* (noble, or full rhyme) are discussed in detail by Klaus von See (1968:217-22). According to him, the first element in the compound *skothent* is derived from the verb *skjóta* in the meaning "to insert," and the term denotes rhymes that were inserted in odd lines between the rhymes in the even lines (assuming that originally only even lines were adorned with such rhymes): the term *aðalhending* was a later invention designed to distinguish between the two types of rhymes (von See 1968:217, 221-22).

19. Kuhn (1983:75-82) surveys in detail the phonetic restrictions and licenses at work in the formation of internal rhymes. His main findings concerning consonants in postvocalic environment can be summarized as follows (1983:76-79): (1) medial *g* (fricative) could not rhyme with *g* (stop, in gemination or after *n*): †*vegr* : *leggja*; and in general also the variants of palatal velar fricatives were kept apart (*eigi* : *auga* does occur, but is rare); (2) *n* before *g* (and *k*) could not rhyme with the nonguttural *n*: †*ben* : *fengum*; (3) as in alliteration, *st*, *sk*, and *sp* (rare in medial/final positions) were treated as units; so also *pf* / *ft*. See also the discussions by Falk 1894 and Kristján Árnason (1991:96-108).

20. I cannot agree with Kristján Árnason (1991:93) that the term "iafnhátt" here refers to the fact that the syllable "grǫm" was followed by a word beginning with a vowel rather than with a consonant ("grǫm *en* þat var skǫmmu"), which, according to Kristján, would make "grǫm" short. In the "Third Grammatical Treatise" (*SnE* II:102), Óláfr Þórðarson uses the line "ól torráðin hóla" to illustrate how a syllable with a long vowel ("ól") could be used instead of a short ("ǫl"), "so that the *hendingar* are equally high" ("til þess að hendíngar sè jafnháfar"), regardless of the fact that the next syllable begins with a consonant ("*t*orráðin"). See also *SnE* II:100.

21. *Stamhent* 'the meter with stuttering rhymes' (Ht 45; *SnE* I:658).

22. This is one of the features that Snorri gives as a characteristic of the meters of the "ancient skalds" (*Fleinsháttr* 'Fleinn's meter,' Ht 57, *SnE* I:670; *Bragaháttr* 'Bragi's meter,' Ht 58, *SnE* I:672).

23. *SnE* I:98-100. See also E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:15-18, 1976:xxi-xxvi). For discussions of the poet Bragi / the god Bragi, see Bugge 1888, 1894; E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:17); de Vries (1957:22-23); and Marold 1986.

24. Erpr lútandi is mentioned in "Skáldatal" (*SnE* III:251, 259). See also Bugge (1894:97); E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1976:xxiv-xxv); de Vries (1957:22); and Kuhn (1983:276).

25. According to Kuhn, Bragi was born in Ireland, son of a Scots or Irish father and a Norwegian mother (with a Celtic name; Bragi was a Norse nom de plume), grew up there, learned the new art (which was based on the alliterative long line but had acquired new features under Celtic influence), and proceeded to perform at Swedish and Danish courts (Kuhn 1983:274; see also Bugge 1894:93-95).

26. See Heusler (1956:287, 299-300, 312-13); Frank (1978:34-35; 1985:178); and von See (1967:38-39). Hollander (1968) does not address the controversy; E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1976:xxvi-xxviii) gives a more detailed discussion based on his earlier article

(1971); Kristján Árnason (1991:9-10, 109-10) raises the issue, but gives no systematic discussion of the features that distinguish the two traditions.

27. Two examples of the latter are James Travis, *Early Celtic Versecraft: Origin, Development, Diffusion* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973), and Mackenzie 1981; E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971 is more circumspect.

28. The works consulted are Thurneysen 1891; Kuno Meyer, *A Primer of Irish Metrics with a Glossary, and an Appendix Containing an Alphabetical List of the Poets of Ireland* (Dublin: School of Irish Learning, 1909); Knott and Murphy 1966; Murphy 1973; and Eleanor Knott, *Irish Syllabic Poetry 1200-1600*, 2d ed. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1981). The most detailed discussion of the relations between Old Irish and skaldic poetry is found in E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1971. See also de Vries 1957; Einar Ól. Sveinsson 1975; and Kristján Árnason (1991:9-10, 109-10).

29. Murphy (1973:3). The use of alliteration will not be discussed here: the alliterating system in *dróttkvætt* followed the same principles as that of the Germanic long-line and eddic *fornyrðislag*, but Irish alliteration functioned differently. See E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:6, 12-13) and Calvert Watkins, "Indo-European Metrics and Archaic Irish Verse," *Celtica* 6 (1963):219-20.

30. Murphy (1973:32) gives the following overview of consonantal classes of rhymes:

Class *g*   [voiced stops]: p (bb) [= b], t (dd) [= d], c (cc) (gg) [= g];
Class *k*   [voiceless stops]: p [= p], t (tt) [= t], c (cc) [k];
Class *x*   [voiceless spirants]: f (ff), ph, th, ch;
Class *l*   [voiced spirants and weakly pronounced (voiced) liquids]: b [= v], m [= nasal v], d [ð], g [γ], l, n, r ;
Class *L*   [strongly pronounced (voiced) liquids]: m (mm) [= m], ll, nn, ng, rr;
Class *s* rhymes only with itself.

The differences between the Old Irish and Old Norse internal rhymes were also noted by Heusler (1956:294); de Vries (1957:16-17); von See (1967:38); E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:11, 1976:xxvii-xxviii); Einar Ól. Sveinsson (1975:211); and Kristján Árnason (1991:109).

31. Quoted from Murphy (1973:17; here and elsewhere in this book the rhymes have been emphasized). The prevailing view among scholars seems to be that the meters of Latin church poetry formed the basis for the development of Irish syllabic rhyming poetry: Thurneysen (1891:168); Marstrander, "Notes on Alliteration," p. 207; Murphy (1973:8-12); Knott and Murphy (1966:25-26), but cf. Travis, *Early Celtic Versecraft*, and Watkins, "Indo-European Metrics," pp. 247-48.

32. Heusler (1956:289-91); Kuhn (1983:82-85, 334-36).

33. Einar Ól. Sveinsson (1962:136); Lie (1952:64); Heusler (1956:291). Felix Niedner, "Egils Hauptlösung," *ZDA* 57 (1920):97-122, argues that the model was the English rhyming poetry; Erik Noreen (1922:17) leaves the question open. Stefán Einarsson, "The Origin of Egill Skallagrímsson's Runhenda" in *Scandinavica et Fenno-*

Ugrica: Studier tillägnade Björn Collinder: Den 22 juli 1954, ed. Dag Strömbäck et al. (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1954), pp. 54-60, believed that the meter originated in Irish/North English verse forms, and Kristján Árnason (1991:164) suggests that the use of end rhyme was either taken over directly from Latin, or the result of English, German [?], or Irish influence. For a good overview of the controversies surrounding the head-ransom episode in *Egils saga*, see Odd Nordland, *Hǫfuðlausn i Egils saga: Ein tradisjonskritisk studie* (Oslo: Det norske samlaget, 1956).

34. Example of the *debide* meters, quoted from Thurneysen (1891:149). These similarities were also pointed out by Heusler (1956:292), who nevertheless held the view that Egill developed his meter independent of Irish models. See also E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:13) and de Vries (1957:16). Einar Ól. Sveinsson 1975 also argues that the skaldic meters *alhneppt* and *halfhneppt*, which end in monosyllables rather than disyllables, had Irish models.

35. See E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1971:15, esp. n.1) and the literature quoted there. For a discussion of Viking activity in Ireland and the archaeological evidence, see Nancy Edwards, *The Archaeology of Early Medieval Ireland*, Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), pp. 172-92.

36. Archaeologists have long disputed whether the first Norse settlement in the Northern Isles was a peaceful or destructive affair, and to what extent the preexisting Pictish and Celtic-Scottish cultures had an impact on the Norse colonists. For an overview of the most recent research in this area, see De Geer (1985:12-15).

37. Consider the following remarks: "Diese freiheit [der wortwahl] kann fast bis zur gänzlichen regellosigkeit gehen, so daß die worte mitunter wie wahllos durcheinander geschüttelt erscheinen" ('This freedom [with regard to the choice of words] can result in almost complete disorder, so that words at times appear to be jolted about at random;' Genzmer, "Das eddische Preislied," p. 148); "Orðfæriði kann ég að meta, en orðskipunina ekki" ('I can appraise the diction, but not the word order;' Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Við uppspretturnar* [Reykjavík: Helgafell, 1956], p. 56); "Skaldic syntax remains a murky and still largely mysterious system" (Frank 1978:49).

38. The dissertations of Wood 1952 and Korin 1969 add little and will not be considered here. For brief treatments of the nature of the parenthetic clause in the *dróttkvætt*, see Hollander 1965 and Staffan Hellberg, "Om inskjutna satser i skaldediktningen," *MM* 1981, pp. 1-24.

39. Frank (1985:165-69) gives an overview of this debate. See also Frederic Amory, "Tmesis in MLat., ON, and OIr. poetry: An Unwritten *notatio norræna*," *ANF* 94 (1979):42-49.

40. 'Try to construct a comparatively simple text, intelligible even during recitation, while attempting to follow the text in the manuscripts as closely as possible as well as considering evidence from other old Germanic languages.' The debate between Finnur Jónsson and E. A. Kock is surveyed in Felix Genzmer, "Alte und neue Auffassung der Skaldendichtung," *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, 17 (1929): 96-110; Kuhn 1934; and Lie, *'Natur' og 'unatur,'* pp. 11-19.

41. For an English translation of Snorri's "Háttatal," see Anthony Faulkes, *Snorri Sturluson: Edda*, Everyman Classics, 499 (London: Dent, 1987). Certain other variants in Snorri's treatise (Ht 14-16, 27) which also deal with syntactic patterns clearly imitate foreign models and will not be discussed here.

42. The *hjástælt* pattern is used to achieve a special effect in Kormákr's "Sigurðardrápa." See Kuhn (1983:179-82) and Marold (1990:112-118). Both *hjástælt* and *tilsagt* will be treated in more detail in Chapters 4 and 6. For a discussion of the validity of Snorri's work for modern research, see Gade (1991 and n.d.).

43. Reichardt (1928:91-119). The English translation of the terms is from D. Edwards (1983:127-28).

44. E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1976:lix-lxiv) gives a brief summary of clause arrangements in *dróttkvætt* poetry; Kabell (1978:280) discusses vertical placement.

45. Most of Kuhn's results are summarized in *Das Dróttkvætt* (1983), and references will be made to that work unless other works contain a more exhaustive discussion. For reviews of *Das Dróttkvætt*, see Fidjestøl 1985; Roberta Frank, "Searching for System in Skaldic Verse," *SS* 59 (1987):374-79; and Gade 1986a, 1988, 1989.

46. In formulating this and the following law on sentence introduction, Kuhn was indebted to Wackernagel's study on Indo-European word order (Jacob Wackernagel , "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung," *IF* 1 [1892]:333-436).

47. This rule first appears in 1969 (Kuhn 1969a:217), and the name of the rule is my own (see Gade 1989).

48. For critical studies, see Hollander (1953:196-97) and Gade 1988, 1989. I would like to caution prospective readers that I was not responsible for the final form of the 1988 article.

49. 'I know of no work from the past fifty years that superseded me in any of the more important areas or prompted me to change my course.' Von See (1967:43-44, 1980:30-31), E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1976:lxiv), and Foote (1984:238) adopt Kuhn's law of the caesura uncritically; Frank (1985:168) is more careful. Kristján Árnason (1991:144) reinterprets Kuhn's syntactic caesuras as a "purely rhythmical phenomenon," but offers little support for his views. In Gade 1986a I critically appraise the foundations of Sievers's system and question its validity in the area of skaldic poetry, and similar criticism is raised by Kristján Árnason (1991:94-95).

50. The name of Þjóðólfr ór Hvini's "Haustlǫng," for example, implies that Þjóðólfr composed the poem during one autumn. Normally the winter seems to have been the time when poetic activity reached its peak (*ÍF* 2:275): "... eptir um vetrinn orti Egill drápu um skjaldar-gjǫfina, er kǫlluð er Berudrápa" (... and later in the winter Egill made a *drápa* about the shield he had received, and it is called "Berudrápa"); (*Sturlunga* 402): "Óláfr Þórðarson hafði ort drápu um Þorlák biskup um vetrinn næsta fyrir andlát Magnúss biskups" (Óláfr Þórðarson had made a *drápa* about Bishop Þorlákr during the winter before the death of Bishop Magnús); (*ÍF* 9:219): "'Ek hefi kveðit vísur nǫkkurar í vetr, er ek kalla Konuvísur, er ek hefi ort um Hákon jarl'" ('I have composed some poems this winter that I call "Konuvísur," which I have made about Earl Hákon').

51. See also *Sturlunga* (p. 269); *Kormáks saga* (*ÍF* 8:277).

52. For similar episodes of competitive extemporaneous composition, see *Hkr* (p. 162); *Morkinskinna* (p. 94).

53. Cf. the use of the word *lúka* (to close) in Snorri's definition of *hjástælt* (*SnE* I:618, emphasis added): "hèr er it fyrsta vísuorð ok annat ok þriðja sèr um mál, ok hefir þó þat mál eina samstöfun með fullu orði af hinu fjórða vísuorði; en þær fimm samstöfur er eptir fara *lúka heilu máli*, ok skal orðtak vera forn minni" (here the first and the second and the third line contain a separate statement and that statement includes one monosyllabic word in the fourth line; and the following five syllables *close the complete poem*).

54. Kuhn 1983 makes many important observations on the structure of *dróttkvætt*, but he admits that his laws and rules, as well as his types of syntactic fillers, do not facilitate the understanding of skaldic poetry to the extent that could be hoped (1983:247). See also Frank (1985:166).

55. Andreas Heusler, "Der Dialog in der altgermanischen erzählenden Dichtung," *ZDA* 46 (1902):189-284, gives a detailed overview of the use of *verba dicendi* in Germanic poetry. See also Bjarni Einarsson, "On the Rôle of Verse in Saga-Literature," *MS* 7(1974):118-25. De Geer (1985:216-27) surveys the research in this area.

56. In "Grottasǫngr" there is a similar incident in which King Fróði tells the giant women not to sleep longer than the time it takes him to recite one poem: Grt 7:3-6 "Sofið eigi it … lengr, enn svát lióð eitt qveðak" (You must sleep … no longer than it takes me to recite one poem; cf. also *ÍF* 8:68, n. 1).

57. For a more complete treatment of the recitation of skaldic poetry, see Gade 1994.

58. Snorri's comments (*SnE* I:608) about "syllables that are pronounced slowly or fast" (*samstöfur seinar eða skjótar*) will be discussed above (Chaps. 3, pp. 60-66, 8, p. 209, 224).

59. My 1986 dissertation contains a critical appraisal of Kuhn's work (cf. also Gade 1988 and 1989), but my subsequent work in this area has shed new light on the complexity of the structure of *dróttkvætt* and has forced me to reformulate and to refine many of my original statements. Kristján Árnason follows my earlier criticism of Sievers and Heusler but, despite the fact that he purports to reexamine the work of Kuhn (Kristján Árnason 1991:1), his book contains few references to Kuhn (except the discussion of disyllabic compounds, pp. 74-75, and a brief comment on the law of the caesura, p. 143-44), and his discussion is not concerned with such aspects as word order, types of syntactic fillers, and the various laws and rules that Kuhn posited for the structure of *dróttkvætt* poetry.

Chapter 2

1. Sophus Bugge (1879:142-43) was the first to discuss the quality of hiatus words.

2. For discussions of Craigie's law, see Marius Kristensen, "Review of Pipping, *Bidrag till eddametriken*," *IF* (Anzeiger) 16 (1904):23-26; Kuhn (1937:58-63, 1983:126-27); von See (1967:45-46); Gade (1989:35-36); Kristján Árnason (1991:114, 120-23).

Moritz Trautmann, "Zum altenglischen Versbau," *Englische Studien* 44 (1911-12):303-42, observed similar restrictions on quantity in Old English alliterative poetry.

3. This debate is discussed in more detail by Gade (1986a:91-98) and, similarly, by Kristján Árnason 1991.

4. The terms "final-maximalistic" and "maximal onset syllabification" are taken from Kristján Árnason (1991:11-23).

5. See Kuhn (1983:53-55); Gade (1989:36, 1993); Kristjan Árnason 1980; Marlys Macken, "Icelandic Coda Rules," (Ms., University of Texas, Austin). The latter work was made available to me as an unfinished manuscript as a part of a correspondence with the author in 1988.

6. Kristján's notions of "heavy" and "light syllables" will be discussed in more detail below. See also Gade 1993.

7. The notion that such "light" words could not carry an ictus is somewhat at cross-purposes with the standard metrical scansions, and will be discussed below.

8. The line given by Kristján Árnason (1991:102) as an example of the latter, "*liðfæð ok skip smæri*," in fact contains a consonantal *r* : *ð* rhyme (*æð* : *ær*; see Kuhn 1983:79).

9. The scarcity of internal rhymes on resolved syllables may have to do with the quality of the second syllable: it appears that an enclitic syllable could have received a stronger stress after a short syllable than after a long syllable (Bugge and Sievers 1891:394; Kuhn 1983:56; Kristján Árnason 1991:133). Such a gradation of stress may be reflected in the occasional vacillation in the placement of internal rhymes, as is demonstrated by the following lines: TE 5:7 Har*ald*s hefk skarð í sk*ild*i; Jór 2:1 H*ar*alds frák Halfdan sp*yr*ja.

10. Kristján discusses sentence stress briefly on pp. 77-80, but only in connection with alliterative poetry, and he does not elaborate on the possible implications the rules of sentence stress might have had for the structure of *dróttkvætt*.

11. This syllabification appears to be valid for *dróttkvætt* lines, but I do not make any claims about the syllabic structure of Old Norse in general. For an overview of the ongoing debate on syllabification in Germanic and Old Norse, see Richard d'Alquen, "Germanic Accent, Syllabification, and the Origin of Scandinavian Accentuation," *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 4 (1992):1-16.

12. Owing to their phonetic shape (long-stemmed root syllables), no pronouns occupy these positions.

13. The conditions that imposed such restrictions on the fillers of positions 3-4 will be explored in Chapter 5.

14. Nominal compounds of the type *Þórleifi, Steingerði, Gunnhildar, hárfagra, Skáneyju, Írlandi* form an exception to this rule and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

15. Sievers's five-type system is discussed by Gade 1986a and, similarly, by Kristján Árnason (1991:45-48, 94-95).

16. Sievers's (and later scholars') use of the terms "primary" and "secondary (word) stress" can be traced back to Karl Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften zur deutschen Philologie*, ed. Karl Müllenhoff (Berlin: Reimer, 1876), 358-406.

17. The term "neutralization" is taken from Kristján Árnason 1991. For a detailed discussion of the phenomena of resolution and neutralization, see Sievers 1878; Kuhn (1983:55-57); and Chapter 3, pp. 60-66.

18. Kuhn appears to have adopted these classifications from Heusler (1956:107-8), who differentiated among three levels of word stress among the following lexico-grammatical categories: *Formwörter* (*f*: connectives, prepositions, pronominal adjectives), *Nomen* (*n*: nomina and qualifying adverbs), and *Verbum* (*v*: finite verbs, intensifying and temporal adverbs).

19. See Vsp 38:3; Hym 25:6, 32:2; HH I, 13:2, 19:4, 26:2, 47:4; HH II, 50:10, 51:4; Sg 45:10, 46:2; Gðr II, 11:2, 41:4; Ghv 16:4.

20. Kuhn (1983:122) observes that such lines are totally absent from *dróttkvætt* poetry, but in twelfth-century *dróttkvætt* poetry we find the following examples: Rkali 1, 2:8 *Bjǫrgynjar til dynja*, Máni 1:2 *Bjǫrgynjar til mǫrgum*, Eilífr 5:6 *síns hjarta til bjartir*.

21. For criticism of Sievers's system, see Gade 1986a, 1989, and Kristján Árnason (1991:94-95). See also J. Franck, "Review of Eduard Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik*," *ADA* 20 (1894):337-43, and Josef Tagelicht, "*Beowulf* and Old English Verse Rhythm," *Review of English Studies*, new ser., 12 (1961):345-46.

22. See especially Sievers (1893:x-xi).

23. For a more detailed discussion of this work, see Gade 1993.

24. The conspicuous absence of Sievers's Type B from Kristján's discussion is probably due to the fact that there are very few lines of this type in his excerpted material, which seems to have consisted mainly of stanzas from the Sturlung compilation (1991:124).

25. Cf. Kuhn's criticism of Reichardt (Kuhn 1934:416).

26. These symbols are a modified version of those used by Kuhn (1983, see Chap. 1, pp. 17-18), with the exclusion of his designation of stress. This alteration may be confusing to some readers familiar with Kuhn's system, but it seems to be the most adequate way of depicting the different entities involved.

27. For a discussion of Kuhn's so-called "heavy dips" see Chapter 3, pp. 56-59.

Chapter 3

1. See Gade 1988 for more detailed criticism.

2. E.g., by E. O. G. Turville-Petre (1976:lxiv), von See (1967:43-44, 1980:30-31), Foote 1984, and, tentatively, by Kristján Árnason (1991:143-44).

3. All these exceptions contain personal names, as in the even lines Vsp 51:2 *koma muno Muspellz*, Od 7:6 *ramt gól Oddrún*, and the odd line Gðr II, 21:1 *færði mér Grímildr*. See also Gðr I, 14:1; Sg 15:1, 27:7, 54:1; Gðr III, 11:7; Od 7:5.

4. "Þá lá hann í útskeri nokkvoru, kominn af skipsbroti, ok höfðu þeir illt til klæða ok veðr kalt, þá orti hann kvæði, er kallat er kviðan skjálfhenda eða drápan steflausa, ok kveðit eptir Sigurðar saga" (*SnE* I:646).

5. *SnE* I:608-10; cf. Kuhn (1983:69), Gade (n.d.), and Kristján Árnason (1991:91-93).

6. "Hèr er í fyrsta ok þriðja vísuorði níu samstöfur, en í öðru ok í fjórða vii; hèr er þat sýnt, hversu flestar samstöfur megu vera í vísuorði með dróttkvæðum hætti" (*SnE* I:610).

7. For example HH I, 1:4 *af Himinfiǫllom*, 8:4 *oc Sigarsvǫllo*, 8:6 *oc Himinvanga*, 13:4, 15:2 *at Logafiǫllom*, 14:4 *und Arasteini*, 15:6 *á Himinvanga*, 22:8 *ór Heðinseyio*, 24:4 *af Trǫnoeyri*, 26:10 *á Varinsfirði*, 30:8, 34:8 *at Gnipalundi*, 31:2 *í Unavágom*, 37:2 *í Varinseyio*, 39:2 *á nesi Ságo*, 40:6, 50:6 *fyr Gnipalundi*, 44:2, 53:4 *at Frecasteini*, 46:6 *á Móinsheimom*, 51:4 *at Sparinsheiði*; HHj 1:4, 42:2 *í munarheimi* (?), 1:8 *at Glasislundi*, 6:4 *né Rǫðulsvǫllom*, 8:2 *í Sigarshólmi*, 12:2 *í Hatafirði*, 35:8 *á Sigarsvǫllom*, 39:2 *at Frecasteini*, 43:4 *né Rǫðulsfialla*; HH II, 5:6, 6:6 *í Brunavágom*, 8:6 *í Bragalundi*, 25:2, 42:2, 45:2, *frá Sefafiǫllom*, 21:2, 26:6 *at Frecasteini*, 24:6 *á Móinsheimom*, 30:6 *und Fiǫturlundi*, 36:2, 48:4 *at Sefafiǫllom*.

8. Kristján Árnason's contention that Sievers used the terms *Auflösung* and *Verschleifung* to distinguish between contractions of lifts and dips must be based on a misreading of the relevant passage in *Altgermanische Metrik* (Kristján Árnason 1991:47; Sievers 1893:27).

9. Kuhn (1983:68) suggests that the two lines of this type that appear to have resolution in position 2 (Korm I, 5:1 *hróðr gerik of mǫg mæran*, Hfr I, 5:1 *ráð lukusk at sá síðan*), may have contained the shorter verbal forms *ger'k* and *lauksk*. That is also the case in Korm lv 61:7 *skjótt segik til þess skotnum* (E4).

10. These four lines are atypical. Three have resolution on a bimoric verb followed by the enclitic negation -*a*: *farið-a*, *skuluð-a*, *samir-a*, and the third line (Korm lv 9:5) has three alliterative staves and resolution on the root stem of a trisyllabic adjective (comparative).

11. Kuhn (1983:68) maintains that the earliest skalds probably allowed resolution only on words that also could be neutralized and that resolution on nomina is a later development.

12. The two lines Eyv lv 2:3 *vér getum bili at bǫlva* (A[3]) and Korm lv 60:4 *minna frama at vinna* (A[5]) are irregular, and, although Sievers (1878:473) regards the former as an instance of elision, it might perhaps be better to classifiy both as A-lines with resolution in position 3.

13. The syntactic fillers of C-lines will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

14. Kristján's contention that there is only one example (from the fifteenth century) in which a light syllable occupies a strong position without cohesion with the consonantal onset of the next syllable is demonstrably incorrect.

15. Kristján Árnason (1991:172) also points out that syllabic cohesion must have been realized in performance, but he fails to notice the relations between cohesion and syntax (which he does not treat at all). Based on observations about syllabic cohesion, he speculates that *dróttkvætt* poetry could have been sung or chanted in some way (see Chap. 1, pp. 26-27).

Chapter 4

1. In the following discussion I shall use the terms "sentence introductory" (lines that introduce a new clause in initial position), "continuing" (lines that continue a clause started in a previous line), and "sentence concluding" (lines that conclude a sentence started in an earlier line). The sentence boundaries will be designated "hard" (sentence boundaries not followed by an introductory element) and "soft" (sentence boundaries followed by an introductory element). The latter two terms are taken over from Kuhn (1983:197-99). To save space, the initial examples given from each type will be limited to ten lines.

2. Kuhn briefly mentions such lines in his discussion of Sievers's Type D4 (Kuhn 1983:165).

3. Our Type E3 Odd comprises Kuhn's Types E[1-2], and, according to him, such lines always contain a syntactic break after position 4 (1983:149).

4. See the discussion of Rieger's observations on the placement of alliteration in odd lines (Chap. 2, pp. 36-37). Kormákr's line *líknsýnir mér lúka* (lv 19:3) is the only line from the ninth and tenth centuries in which a substantival pronoun, rather than a verb, occupies position 4. The line also violates Kuhn's law of sentence particles, as well as the word order of prose (verb second), and it is not unlikely that this stanza, as well as Steingerðr's response, is a later interpolation.

5. Egill's lv 22:1-5 is quite problematic, and from syntactic considerations I have adopted the following translation:

> Eg lv 22:1-5   borðumk vér / né virðak
> 　　　　　　　　 (vígleiptr) / sonar heiptir
> 　　　　　　　　 Blóðøxar / (rauðk blóði)
> 　　　　　　　　 boðmilds ok Gunnhildar.

> (We fought, and I did not heed the hatred of the son of battle-eager Bloodax and Gunnhildr; I reddened the battle flame in blood.)

6. Kuhn is forced to admit that, unlike odd lines, even E-lines rarely have a syntactic unit in positions 1-4 (Kuhn 1983:166), but he ascribes that circumstance, as well as similar syntactic organization of A2k-lines, to the fact that alliteration had lost its structuring power in even lines (Kuhn 1983:159-61).

7. See Kuhn (1983:262) and Poole (1991:173-81).

8. Kuhn 1983 briefly discusses our Types E3-4 Verbal as subgroups of his odd E-lines on pp. 150-51.

9. Other verbs with a similar meaning, like *hyggja* (think, believe), *sýnask* (appear), also occur in lines belonging to this pattern: Korm lv 13:3 *hann sýnisk mér heima*, Korm lv 47:3 *Týr sýndisk mér taura*, GSúrs 3:1 *betr hugðak þá / brigði*, Eskál IV, 3:7 *víst*

hyggjum þat viggja. These lines correspond closely to eddic lines like Grp 24:1, 40:1 *verst hyggiom því*.

10. Our Types XE3-4 correspond to Kuhn's Types XE and XB (Kuhn 1983:156-59), but because Kuhn's demarcation of these two types depends on his distribution of stress, rather than on the syllabic structure of the lines, there is no direct correspondence between his Types XE and XB and our XE3-4 in terms of distribution.

11. For brief discussions of our Types E3-4 Verbal Even, see Kuhn (1983:167). The line Ormr 1:2 *dís / ramman spyrk vísa*, with a verb in position 3, technically belongs to E3, but, because of the placement of the sentence boundary, I have grouped it under E3 Verbal. The line will not be part of the present discussion.

12. *Hjástælt* will be discussed in more detail in Chap. 6 (p. 156).

13. Kuhn (1983:149) briefly mentions this type as a variant of his Type E with a syntactic caesura after position 4.

14. Cf. Kuhn (1983:175-79).

15. Þórleifr's line *él festisk et vestra* (Þjsk III, 1:2), with a proclitic definite article in position 4, is exceptional, but serves to show that Kuhn's distribution of stresses in E3-lines (full stress on the word in position 4) is questionable.

16. The term "bound clause" is a translation of Kuhn's *gebundener Satz* (Kuhn 1983:43), and denotes a sentence introduced by an adverb or conjunction.

17. Cf. Kuhn (1983:141).

Chapter 5

1. The terms "monosemantic" and "bisemantic compounds" translate the German *Kompositum von einfacher/doppelter begrifflicher Kraft* (Karl Fuhr, *Die Metrik des westgermanischen Allitterationsverses* [Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuch-handlung, 1892]); Heusler 1956:110). For the purposes of this book, I shall define bisemantic compounds as those compounds that can be paraphrased in the sequence Q+BW (e.g., *vágs hyrsendir = vágs hyrs sendir*) or as a verbal phrase (e.g., *Hristisif hringa = Sif hristir hringa*); all other compounds, including personal names, are monosemantic (e.g., *Skjǫldungr*).

2. See also Gráf 3:8; Korm lv 26:8, lv 27:4, lv 36:8, lv 48:4; Hást 8:4; VGl 5:8; Hfr V, 21:4.

3. The only exception is Korm lv 30:6, with a vocative in the cadence. The term "no immediate syntactic connection" may appear somewhat imprecise, but in the few *helmingar* that consist of one uninterrupted clause, the two *vísufjórðungar* are made up of two separate entities, as in the following example:

> Eyv lv 11:1-5   *skyldak* skerja foldar
> skíðrennandi *síðan*
> þursa tœs frá þvísa
> *þinn góðan byr finna.*

4. Exceptions are: Gldr 1:4 *ey vébrautar heyja*, Eg lv 28:4 *mey / ǫrlygi at heyja*, Eyv lv 8:4 *fræ Hákonar ævi*, and Rdr 9:4 *men dreyrugra benja*, GSúrs 20:6 *hafa bláfoldar skafla*. The first three lines contain *ey : eyj / æ : æv*-rhymes, and in the latter two there are no syntactic units in positions 1-4, but the lines contain no sentence boundaries.

5. Such clusters of D2-lines are found in the following stanzas: Rdr 2:2, 2:4, 8:4, 8:8; Gldr 4:4, 4:8, 5:6, 5:8, 7:4, 7:6, 7:8; Kveld 1:6, 1:8; Eg lv 6:2, 6:8, 14:4, 14:8, 28:4, 28:6, 38:6, 38:8; Jór 5:6, 5:8; Glúmr lv 1:2, 1:8; Korm lv 7:4, 7:8, 13:6, 13:8, 15:4, 15:8, 18:2, 18:8, 21:4, 21:8, 38:2, 38:4; HolmgB 2:6, 2:8; Vst 2:2, 2:4; GSúrs 30:4, 30:6, 30:8, 36:6, 36:8; Þmáhl 6:6, 6:8; Vell 8:6, 8:8, 12:2, 12:8, 15:2, 15:8, 16:4, 16:6, 19:2, 19:4, 28:6, 28:8; Bbreiðv 6:2, 6:8; Hfr II, 7:2, 7:4; Hfr III, 5:6, 5:8, 18:4, 18:8, 28:4, 28:8; Hfr V, 4:2, 4:4.

6. For example TE 1:2 *né Hrollaugi fljúga*, 1:6 *of kerstraumi rómu*, 2:8 *at Háfœtu grjóti*, 5:6 *við hugfullan stilli*, and 4:4 *ósmábornir gjarnir*. I cannot agree with Russell Poole (1991:169-70) that the D1-line *ósmábornir gjarnir* served as the model for Snorri's "Torf-Einars háttr." Snorri clearly states that the meter is characterized by *riðhent* and *skothendingar* in the even lines ("í ǫðru ok fjórða skothent ok riðhent," *SnE* I:668), and all *riðhent* lines in "Háttatal" are made up of D2-lines (no D1-line occurs).

7. In the *fornskaldahættir* "Torf-Einarr's meter" precedes "Egill's meter," whose most prominent features are *aðalhendingar* and *riðhent* (Ht 55-56; *SnE* I: 668-70), and the logical progression would be from *skothendingar* and *riðhent* ("Torf-Einarr's meter") to *aðalhendingar* and *riðhent* ("Egill's meter").

8. In Egill's *lausavísa* 45:5-8, I have adopted the following reading:

> Eg lv 45:5-8,   es jarðgǫfugr orðum
>   (orð mín) / konungr forðum
>   (hafði gramr at gamni)
>   Geirhamðis mik framði.

> (When the land-distinguished king earlier graced me with the giant's words [gold], the prince took pleasure in my poetry.)

9. Other examples of similar constructions occur in Sindr 1:1-2 (*trað árum*), Korm lv 28:5-6 (*Áta húsa*), Korm lv 40:5-6 (*í einum sæing gǫngum*), Eskál IV, 2:1-2 (*auka þorir sverðum*), Stefnir 1:5-6 (*standa úti*), Hfr III, 18:1-2 (*réð norðan*), Hfr III, 22:5-6 (*ór éli stála*), and Hfr III, 23:5-6 (*mundjǫkuls stýrir*).

10. Even A2k-lines occur more than once in the following stanzas: Haustl 4:6, 4:8, 6:4, 6:8, 9:4, 9:6; 12:6, 12:8; Þjóð IV, 2:2, 2:6; Gldr 1:2, 1:8, 8:2, 8:6, 9:2, 9:4; Eg I, 1:4, 1:8, 2:2; Eg lv 11:4, 11:6, 15:6, 15:8, 18:4, 18:8, 20:4, 20:8, 22:2, 22:6; 26:2, 26:4 36:2, 36:4; Jór 5:2, 5:4; Sindr 2:2, 2:6; Eyv lv 1:2, 1:4, 1:6, 2:2, 2:6, 2:8, 5:2, 5:4, 5:6, 5:8, 13:6, 13:8; Gráf 11:4, 11:8; Korm lv 10:4, 10:8, 27:2, 27:8, 28:4, 28:6, 29:4, 29:6; HolmgB 1:4, 1:6, 8:2, 8:6, 8:8, 9:2, 9:4, 9:6, 13:2, 13:4; Hást 1:2, 1:6, 6:2, 6:8, 8:6, 8:8; EValg 1:6, 1:8; GSúrs 7:2, 7:6, 8:2, 8:4, 33:2, 33:4; Þmáhl 2:2, 2:4, 2:6, 12:2, 12:6; VGl

1:2, 1:8; Vell 7:2, 7:6, 11:4, 11:8, 20:6, 20:8, 23:6, 23:8, 37:6, 37:8; Bbreiðv 3:2, 3:4, 3:6; Húsdr 3:2, 3:4; Tindr II, 1:2, 1:6, 1:8; Hfr I, 5:2, 5:4, 8:2, 8:4; Hfr II, 8:2, 8:6; Hfr III, 5:2, 5:4, 11:2, 11:4, 11:8, 22:4, 22:6, 29:6, 29:8; Hfr V, 1:2, 1:8, 13:4, 13:8.

11. Two lines contain a verb in the cadence: Rdr 8:3 *til fárhuga fœra*, Vell 3:3 *fyr ǫrþeysi at ausa*.

12. Korm lv 41:5-8 and VGl 11:5-8 contain uninterrupted clauses, and only lines 5 and 8 will be listed here. The interpretation of line 6 in Kormákr's *lausavísa* is uncertain.

13. Þjsk I, 1:5 has a personal pronoun (*þú*) plus a verb in position 1.

Chapter 6

1. Long nominal syllables in position 2 are characteristic of the *skjalfhent* variant of *dróttkvætt* and will not be discussed here (see Chap. 3, pp. 56-59). Kuhn discusses our Types A1$^{1-4}$ as one group (Kuhn 1983:135-37).

2. Four lines contain the sequence BW+Q: Eg lv 2:1 *sǫgðuð sverri flagða*, Eg lv 30:1 *hǫggum hjaltvǫnd skyggðan*, Eg lv 30:7 *kyrrum kappa errinn*, Hfr V, 4:1 *fœrum festar órar*.

3. Three lines have a finite verb in positions 1-2 and an infinitive in the cadence: Rdr 19:1 *vildit vrǫngum ofra*, Korm lv 42:1 *heitask hellur fljóta*, Korm lv 55:5 *gátut gjallar mœta*.

4. See also Gráf 13:2 (*tanna - Hallinskíða*), Korm lv 7:2 (*auga - annat*), Bbreiðv 4:4 (*of hyggja - mínu ráði*), EVald 1:4 (*bjó sín - veiðarfœri*), Hfr V, 21:8 (*selk af - ábyrgð mína*). Exceptions are Gráf 2:4 and Hfr II, 9:8, which complete phrases from line 2 (*drótt - írskrar þjóðar, hjó - kumbrskar þjóðir*).

5. The even lines in Ht 30 all have a nominal phrase in positions 3-6 and internal rhymes in positions 1 and 5: Ht 30:2 *halda grœna skjalda*, Ht 30:4 *þilju Hrungnis ilja*, Ht 30:6 *vandar margra landa*, Ht 30:8 *elli dolga fellir*. According to Snorri, the third syllable decides the meter ("ræðr hèr hin þriðja samstafa"; SnE I:640), and this comment could refer to the fact that the word in positions 3-4 forms a syntactic unit with the word in the cadence.

6. Similar constructions occur in Haustl 14:7, Eg lv 44:1, Korm lv 55:7, Hást 3:1, Tindr II, 2:1, Hfr II, 7:1, Hfr II, 9:3, Hfr III, 2:7, Hfr III, 25:3.

7. In Þórarinn's line, Þmáhl 13:7 *lind beit / lǫgðis kindir*, the words in positions 1-2 conclude rather than introduce a sentence.

8. Cf. *Gauts gáttar gunnsvells lundr* 'the wood of the battle bulge of Gautr's [Óðinn's] door frame,' i.e., 'wood of the battle bulge of the shield [= sword]' = "warrior."

9. An additional three lines of the latter structure are sentence introductory, and the verbs occur in the following even line: Þorggoð 1:1 *geirr í gumna sárum // gnast*; GSúrs 6:1 *bǫllr á byrðar stalli // brast*; ÓTr 1:1 *einn í olpu grœnni // ek fekk dreng til strengjar*. All three lines are from *lausavísur*, and the placement of the verbs is unusual.

10. The only exception is Hfr III, 3:3 *gram / þanns gunni framði*.

11. Lines like Gldr 8:2-3 *margspakr / Niðar varga // lundr vann sókn á sandi*, Gráf 3:6-7 *sverðleiks reginn / ferðir // sendi gramr at grundu*, Eyv lv 6:6-7 *Eireks of rak/geira // nú tregr Gætigauta*, are rare, and longer sentences introduced in an even line are regularly bound clauses, with an introductory element in position 2, 3, or 4. Kormákr's A^2-line, lv 32:2 *hví þú skyldir verða*, is exceptional.

12. Odd A^2-lines contain the following examples of one-line clauses: A1^2: Hgóði 1:3, Eyv lv 10:5, Korm lv 4:3, Korm lv 55:7, Þþyn 1:3, Hfr III, 25:3, Hfr V, 3:3, Hfr V, 27:3; A3^2: TE 2:7, Hfr V, 14:7, Þdís I, 2:1, Hfr V, 6:3.

13. Þórleifr's line, IV, 5:5 *en / þeims upp réð brenna*, has an introductory element in position 1 and is sentence introductory.

14. Only three lines (Gldr 7:7, 8:3; Eg lv 18:7) are sentence continuing.

15. One line has a pronoun in position 4: Hást 8:5 *en á braut þeir báru*.

16. The following five lines are sentence continuing: Korm lv 35:6, Bbreiðv 1:6, Húsdr 12:2, ÓTr 1:2, and Hfr V, 19:2.

17. The last *hjástælt* line in "Sigurðardrápa," Korm I, 6:4 *fats / véltu goð Þjaza* (Type E3 Verbal), refers to the gods tricking the giant Þjazi.

18. Þjóðólfr's line, with variations, occurs in the following stanzas: Hharð 15:4 *framm / en þat vas skǫmmu*, 15:8 *sǫng / en þat vas lǫngu*, 16:4 *framm / vas þat fyr skǫmmu*, 16:8 *rǫng / en þat vas lǫngu;* ÞjóðA lv 13:4 *grǫm / en þat vas skǫmmu*, 13:8 *stǫng / en þat vas lǫngu*; Anon. XI, 7, lv 8:4 *vǫmm / en þat vas skǫmmu*, 8:8 *svǫng / en þat vas lǫngu*. See also Korm lv 1:4 *ramma ást / fyr skǫmmu*.

19. One line, Eyv lv 10:8 *fellr á hendr mér elli*, has a pronoun in position 4.

20. Two lines have a verb or the infinitive marker *at* in position 3: GSúrs 26:1 *skuluða it / kvað skorða*, Korm lv 9:5 *makaras mér at mæla*.

21. Gísli's two lines with direct speech and a *verbum dicendi* in position 4 are unique: GSúrs 26:1 *skuluða it / kvað skorða*, GSúrs 24:1 *hingat skalt / kvað hringa* (see also GSúrs 14:1 *hyggið at / kvað Egða*, 15:1 *gerskat næmr / kvað Nauma* [A3^4], and GSúrs 14:5 *svá átt / kvað Bil blæju* [XE4]).

22. Five lines are sentence continuing (Gráf 3:7, Vell 24:3, Hfr I, 9:3, Eg lv 45:7, Þmáhl 10:7). Only Eg lv 41:5 *þeiras hauks fyr handan* and Korm lv 40:5 *nærgis oss í eina* do not have finite verbs in positions 1-2.

23. Sigvatr's "Erfidrápa" to King Óláfr Haraldsson owes a great deal to Hallfreðr's "Erfidrápa," and at times Sigvatr repeats lines and phrases almost verbatim from Hallfreðr's poem (e.g., Hfr III, 4:7-8 *mest í malma gnaustan // minn dróttinn framm sótti:* Sigv XII, 12:1-2 *mest frák merkjum næstan // minn dróttin framm sínum*, 17:6 *Þróttr hinns framm of sótti*, 18:4 *hann sótti framm dróttin*; Hfr III, 19:4, Sigv XII, 3:2 *flugstyggs sonar Trygga*; Hfr III, 29:2 *hugreifum Áleifi:* Sigv XII, 13:2 *gnýreifum Áleifi*; Hfr III, 16:8 *(heldi) sunds Þórketill undan:* Sigv XII, 19:8 *fund en Dagr helt undan*). Despite the fact that Sigvatr knew Hallfreðr's poem and borrowed extensively from it, however, his "Erfidrápa" lacks the personal qualities of Hallfreðr's eulogy, and most of the personal references are limited to "affirmations of hearsay" (*frák*, etc.).

24. See also Korm lv 37:8, Leiknir 1:2, Jór 3:4.

25. Only Egill's line Eg lv 34:2 *silki drengr of fengit* is sentence continuing.

26. See Eg VI, 1:1, VI, 1:3; Eg lv 1:5, 1:6, 1:7, 1:8, 2:1, 2:5, 3:2, 3:1, 3:5, 4:1, 6:3, 6:5, 7:5, 7:7, 8:1, 8:3, 11:5, 13:1, 16:3, 17:3, 19:7, 20:3, 21:1, 22:1, 26:8, 27:1, 27:3, 30:1, 30:2, 30:3, 30:4, 30:5, 30:6, 30:7, 31:3, 31:5, 32:5, 33:1, 33:5, 35:2, 36:1, 36:5, 37:6, 39:2, 40:1, 40:5, 41:1, 43:1, 43:7, 45:1, 45:7.

27. That would include all instances of suspended subjects that occur in initial position in the even line.

28. For a discussion of vertical placement (*Tiefstellung*), see Reichardt 1928 and Chap. 1 (p. 17). This linking device will be discussed at length in Chapter 7.

29. That is, unless position 1 is occupied by the definite article, *of*, or *ok*, as in Eg lv 32:1 *fell / sás flest et illa*, Haustl 8:5 *þá varð Þórs of rúni*, Eg lv 19:3 *reið sé rǫgn ok Óðinn*.

30. Type A1⁴ has no lines with a sentence boundary after position 3.

Chapter 7

1. For detailed examinations of clause arrangements in *dróttkvætt* poetry, see Reichardt 1928 and D. Edwards 1983. Our discussion of clause functions focuses on aspects not covered in those studies.

2. Kuhn's tendency to treat verbs to which he assigns full stress as sentence particles (e.g., in Types E3, E4, and A2k) is difficult to understand (see Kuhn 1983:201-2).

3. Exceptions are Þorggoð 1:1-2 *geirr í gumna sárum // gnast*, GSúrs 6:1-2 *bǫllr á byrðar stalli // brast*, ÓTr 1:1-2 *einn í olpu grœnni // ek fekk dreng til strengjar*, Korm lv 37:3-4 *allt gjalfr eyja þjalfa // út líðr í stað víðis*, Hfr V, 11:3-4 *fyr Svipnjǫrðum sverða // sverðótt mun nú verða*, and the even lines Vell 16:6-7 *aptr geirbrúar hapta // auðrýrir lætr áru*, GSúrs 2:6-7 *faðir minn af þraut þinni // stofnask styrjar efni*. Most of these lines are part of *helmingar* that are characterized by unusual verbal or metrical features. The first two lines from *Gísla saga* belong to formulaic exchanges (question/answer), each consisting of two lines; Óláfr's line is part of a riposte to a *helmingr* by Hallfreðr (Hfr V, 4:4 *hvars Akkerisfrakki*, ÓTr 1:4 *hérs Akkerisfrakki*); Kormákr's line is in the *skjalfhent* variant of *dróttkvætt*; Hallfreðr's line is from his "sword" stanza and violates Kuhn's law of sentence introduction (preposition in position 1). The line from Gísli's second *lausavísa* not only violates Craigie's law (position 4 is occupied by a long nomen), but also contains irregular second alliteration in positions 4 and 5.

4. Gísli's lines with direct speech introduced by the verb *kvað* in position 3 or 4 are exceptions (cf. GSúrs 26:1 *skuluða it / kvað skorða*, 24:1 *hingat skalt / kvað hringa*, 14:1 *hyggið at / kvað Egða*, 15:1 *gerskat nœmr / kvað Nauma*, and 14:5 *svá átt / kvað Bil blæju*). Kuhn's contention that all independent clauses must begin in position 1 or 2 of a line is in need of some modification (Kuhn 1933:30, 1983:194).

5. In Bersi's two lines (HolmgB 2:5 *randlauki klaufk / randa* and HolmgB 4:5 *gamall emk/geira vimrar*) the clauses introduced in positions 5 and 3 are continued in line 3 rather than in line 2: HolmgB 2:7-8 *(randa) vildit framm af feldi // Freyr*, HolmgB 4:7-8 *(geira vimrar) uggik hvergi at hyggja // (Hlakkar veðr) / umb blakka*.

6. I cannot share Kuhn's view that no introductory elements could be extraposed (Kuhn 1983:203). Kuhn also notes that finite verbs cannot be extraposed (ibid.). This, of course, stands to reason, because such a verb automatically signals sentence introduction (e.g., Korm I, 4:1 *svall / þás gekk með gjallan*, Eg lv 10:1 *gekk / sás óðisk ekki*).

7. The only exceptions from the ninth and tenth centuries are Hfr V, 11 :3 *fyr Svipnjǫrðum sverða*, Eg lv 28:5 *við þann / es bítr / ok blótar*, and Eg lv 33:3 *af þvít eggjar deyfði* (see Kuhn 1983:202). The latter line has later correspondences in such lines as Sigv XI, 5:3 *af þvít eignum lofða* and ÞjóðA I, 4:3 *af þvít ýtar hǫfðu*.

8. I do not regard the short introductory clauses in the first line of a *helmingr* (*veitk, svá frák hitt*, etc.) as parenthetic. For brief observations on parenthetic clauses in *dróttkvætt* see Hollander 1965, Staffan Hellberg, "Om inskjutna satser i skaldediktningen," *MM* 1981, pp. 1-24, and Kuhn (1983:194-95).

9. Verbal repetitions, especially of words carrying internal rhymes, occur in such lines as Korm lv 2:3, Þjsk IV, 4:7 *oss hlægir þat eigi*, Eg lv 32:4 *eir veittak Friðgeiri*, Eg lv 45:2 *biðk eirar Syn geira*, Þmáhl 17:6 *sék þeira lið meira*, Korm lv 25:4 *varð þeira hlutr meiri*, ÞHjalt 2:6 *þeir hǫfðu lið fleira*, Hást 6:6 *hlutu þeir bana fleiri*, Eg lv 40:4 *varðk einn bani þeira*, Korm lv 36:2 *skulum tveir banar þeira*, Korm lv 16:4 *erut þeir banar mínir*, Stefnir 1:2 *erumk leið fǫður reiði*, Hfr V, 9:6 *erumk leið sonar reiði*, Jór 1:2 *beið herr konungs reiði*, Hást 4:6, Þmáhl 8:6 *hrafn sleit af á beitu*, Þjsk I, 1:6 *etr hrafn af ná getnum*.

10. The patterns in line 4 will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

11. For discussions of the use of forms of address in *dróttkvætt* poems, see Kuhn (1983:205-6) and Frank 1990.

12. Exceptions are Eg lv 17:8, Haustl 16:4, Gldr 5:8, and Skall 2:8.

13. Other lines are Eg lv 12:8; Korm lv 21:4, 25:8, 35:4; GSúrs 17:8, 19:8, 20:8, 22:8; Skall 2:8; Stefnir 1:4; VGl 1:4; Gríss 1:4; Leiknir 1:8.

14. As the following stanzas show, the content of Korm lv 40 and Sg 68 is strikingly similar:

Korm lv 40 hvílum handar bála
      Hlín / (valda skǫp sínu)
      (þat séum reið at ráði)
      (rík) / tveim megin bríkar;
      nærgis oss í eina
      angrlaust sæing gǫngum
      dýr skǫfnunga drafnar
      dynjeyjar vit Freyja.

Sg 68   Liggi occar enn í milli
           málmr hringvariðr
           egghvast iárn
           svá endr lagið
           þá er við bæði
           beð einn stigom
           oc hétom þá
           hióna nafni.

Kormákr's line *angrlaust sæing gǫngum* is also echoed in the second lay of Helgi (47:1-3 *hér hefi ec þér Helgi || hvílo gorva || angrlausa miǫc*). Although one can only speculate about the connections between the poetry in *Kormáks saga* and the eddic lays, the verbal agreements are sometimes too clear to be overlooked, as in the following lines from Steingerðr's *lausavísa* and the short lay of Sigurðr: Steing 1:3-4 *yrði goð sem gerðisk || góð mér ok skǫp / Fróða,* Sg 58:9-10 *ef ocr góð um scǫp || gerði verða*).

15. For a discussion of this stanza, see E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1944.

16. Other than suspicious forms that could be due to faulty manuscript transmission (see the late forms noted by Kuhn 1983:290), the poems in *Gísla saga* contain certain features that force the conclusion that they are from later than the tenth century: for example, a sentence-introductory even E4-line with a secondary alliteration in position 4 and a violation of Craigie's law (GSúrs 2:6 *faðir minn af þraut þinni*); the order BW+Q in line-initial position (GSúrs 21:6 *snyrti hrings*); the high number of *eigi* negations (see Kuhn 1983:291); and the unprecedented stanzas with direct speech (the only other early examples occur in "Haustlǫng," stanza 11, Korm lv 52, and Eskál IV, 3). However, none of the stanzas contains features that are exclusively associated with later centuries (such as Types B and C with internal rhymes in anacrusis, an increase in the use of Type D2 Odd, XE3-4, and long nominal syllables in ×-positions). Hence, although most of the poems bear all the marks of being premeditated, it is difficult to believe that they could have been composed later than the middle of the eleventh century.

17. For thorough discussions of *lausavísur* that may have belonged to longer poems, see Russell Poole 1991, his "Skaldic Poetry in the Sagas: The Origins, Authorship, Genre, and Style of Some Saga *Lausavísur*," (Diss., University of Toronto, 1975), and "The Origins of the *Máhlíðingavísur*," *SS* 57 (1985):244-85.

18. This is especially likely for the stanzas in *Gísla saga* (see E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1944) and *Kormáks saga.*

19. The examination of the sentence structure of all skalds from the earliest two centuries rather seems to suggest that, in Bragi's stanzas, we are dealing with an early stage of a continuous development that culminates in the tenth century and once again declines around the turn of the eleventh century.

20. Other examples of enjambment between even and odd lines occur in Eg lv 23:6-7 *þeiri || Gestils ǫlpt,* Sindr 5:2-3 *at því fljóði || Ónars,* Eyv lv 8:2-3 *á hauka || fjǫllum,*

Korm lv 17:6-7 *meira // ǫfund*, Brúsi 1:2-3 *borða // stóðs*, Vell 35:2-3 *rómu // Hárs*, and Hfr II, 6:2-3 *fyr styggvan // Leiknar hest.*

21. Kuhn observed that enjambment between even and odd lines was rare, but he did not consider such enjambment in violation of skaldic practice ("nicht . . . stilwidrig") and was at a loss to explain why it was avoided (1983:187).

22. For a detailed but undeservedly neglected study on enjambment in alliterative (especially Old English) poetry, see Adolf Bohlen, *Zusammengehörige Wortgruppen, getrennt durch Cäsur oder Versschluss in der angelsächsischen Epik* (Diss., Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Berlin, Philosophische Fakultät; Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1908).

Chapter 8

1. The only exception from the ninth and tenth centuries is Húsdr 12 (see Reichardt 1928:76):

Húsdr 12	þar kømr á / (en æri
	endr bark mærð af hendi)
	(ofrak svá) / til sævar
	(sverðregns) / (lofi þegna).

2. The only exception to this rule in *dróttkvætt* stanzas from the ninth and tenth centuries is Gldr 7:1-4 (Gldr 7:1 *ríks / þreifsk reiddra øxa*).

3. In the "Third Grammatical Treatise," Óláfr Þórðarson writes: "TMESIS slítr í sund eitt orð, ok setr annan part í milli." (*tmesis* splits one word asunder and inserts another part in between; *SnE* II:176). As an example, he gives the following lines with tmesis on the place name *Stiklar-staðir* (ibid., emphasis added): Ekl vara ógn á **Stiklar** ǁ óblíð **stöðum** síðan.

4. For the most recent contribution to that debate, see Jónas Kristjánsson, "Stages in the Compositions of Eddic Poetry," in *Atti*, pp. 201-18. See also Kuhn (1939), and the detailed overview of the state of the art by Joseph Harris ("Eddic Poetry," in *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature: A Critical Guide*, Islandica 45, ed. Carol J. Clover and John Lindow [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985], pp. 68-156).

5. He writes (1969a:211):

> Es [das Dróttkvætt] ist von dem Langzeilenmaß, dem Versmaß der alten epischen Dichtung, ausgegangen, und zwar in dessen strengeren Formen, die es besonders in großen Teilen des nordischen Fornyrðislags erhalten hat, und hat von ihm auch die geregelte Form der achtzeiligen Strophe übernommen. Doch läßt sich nicht erkennen, bis zu welcher Stufe der Regelmäßigkeit sowohl in der Silbenzahl der Verse und ihrem Bestand an Typen wie im Strophenbau dies Fornyrðislag gelangt war, als es zur Grundlage für das Dróttkvætt wurde.

(It [*dróttkvætt*] evolved from the meter of long lines, the meter of the old epic poetry, and, more particularly, from its stricter forms as preserved in large sections of Norse *fornyrðislag*. From this meter it also adopted the regularized eight-line stanza. Yet, as far as the number of syllables in the line, the inventory of types, and stanzaic structure are concerned, it is impossible to say what level of regularization *fornyrðislag* had reached when it served as the basis of *dróttkvætt*.)

6. See Kuhn (1969a:211, 1983:336); whereas Sievers (1893:117) and Heusler (1956:203) believed that the trisyllabic odd lines were modeled on the occasional "unterepische Füllungen," whose reflexes are found in *fornyrðislag* lines like Sg 27:3 *systor sonr*, Sg 30:7 *giallan grát*, Sg 63:7 *sína mey* (cf. *dróttkvætt* lines of Type A[5]: Rdr 2:3 *meyjar hjóls enn mæri*). For more detailed descriptions of *kviðuháttr*, see Sievers (1893:117-18) and Heusler (1956:202-4).

7. The Rök-inscription can be transcribed as follows (Wessén 1958:24): "raið [þ]iaurikʀ hin þurmuþi stilliʀ I flutna strąntu hraiþmaraʀ sitiʀ nu karuʀ ą I kuta sinum skialti ub fatlaþʀ skati marika."

8. See Heusler (1956:282-83). As examples he lists, among others, "brimdýr blásvǫrt" (< "*brimjadiuʀu blāwaswartu") and "hverir hefði lopt allt"(< "*hwarjai haḇēdǣðin luftam allata").

9. In his discussion of the Rök-stanza, Kabell (1978:250) maintains that both the alliteration and the syllable counting had been taken over from Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastic poetry. For a criticism of that view, see von See,"Stabreim und Endreim," p. 416.

10. I am grateful to Hans Fix-Bonner for making the conclusion of his *Habilitationsschrift* available to me.

OMISSIONS

Ninth Century:

Bragi (Rdr 6:5-8; 10:4; II, 1:3; II, 2; II, 4); Auðunn illskælda (all); Qlvir hnúfa (all); Þjóðólfr ór Hvini (Haustl 1:1-4; 11; 12:1-2; 16:2, 5-8; 17:1-8); Þórbjǫrn hornklofi (*lausavísa*); Torf-Einarr (3:8).

Tenth Century:

Egill Skallagrímsson (I, 1:1; V, 1:5-6; VI, 1:7-8; *lausavísur* 12:1-2; 15:1-4; 16:2; 26:7; 27:7-8; 33:8; 40:7-8); Goþþormr Sindri (Hdr 1:7; 2:3-4; 3:3-4; 7:6; 8:7-8); Glúmr Geirason (Gráf 1:2; *stef*); Kormákr Qgmundarsson (I, 3:3-4; *lausavísur* 8:6; 14:5-8; 15:6-7; 19:1; 22:4; 23:5-6; 27:5; 30:8; 31:5-6, 8; 34:5; 36:3; 41:5-6; 43:7; 44:6; 45:6; 46:6; 47:2, 6; 51:5-8; 52:6; 53:5-8; 55:2-4; 57; 58; 62); Holmgǫngu-Bersi Véleifsson (11:1-2); Hásteinn Hrómundarson halta (5:8); Þórkell klyppr Þórðarson (1:5-8); Gísli Súrsson (5:3-4; 9:1-2; 12:3, 5-8; 32:8); Þórarinn máhlíðingr (9:5-6; 14:5-6; 15:8); Þórvaldr Hjaltason (1:5-8; 2:1-4, 7-8); Víga-Glúmr Eyjólfsson (5:4; 7:7-8; 9:1, 5, 8); Vígfúss Vígaglúmsson (II, 1:5-8); Einarr skálaglamm (Vell 13:2, 4; 10; 24:8; 27:3; IV, 1:5-8); Þórvaldr enn veili (*lausavísa*); Úlfr Uggason (Húsdr 2; II); Gamli gnævaðarskald (2:2-4); Þórleifr jarlsskald (I, 2:1; IV, 2, 5-8; 3:3-8); Tindr Hallkelsson ("Hákonardrápa"); Eilífr Goðrúnarson ("Þórsdrápa"); Þórarinn (1:5); Hallfreðr vandræðaskald (I, 4:1; 9:4; II, 3:3; III, 6:8; 8; 13:2-4; V, 5:5-8).

APPENDIX: SUMMARY OF TYPES

Type	Odd lines	Encomiastic (%)	Even lines	Encomiastic (%)
E1	—	—	2	—
E2	—	—	18	39
E2 Verbal	—	—	15	20
E3	153	50	195	43
E3 Verbal	55	13	64	28
XE3	39	10	—	—
E4	8	75	235	33
E4 Verbal	10	60	59	29
XE4	50	24	—	—
B	13	62	—	—
Total	328	33	588	37
D1	30	67	61	24
D2	8	15	210	45
A2k	8	50	294	40
A2k Verbal	—	—	22	14
C	189	38	—	—
Total	235	41	587	39
A^1	—	—	40	40
$A1^1$	86	36	—	—
$A1^1$ skjalfhent	10	—	—	—
$A2^1$	3	33	—	—
$A3^1$	24	25	—	—
Total	123	34	40	40

A^2	—	—	80	30
$A1^2$	222	37	—	—
$A2^2$	—	—	—	—
$A3^2$	82	23	—	—
Total	304	34	80	30
A^3	—	—	93	23
$A1^3$	32	19	—	—
$A2^3$	8	75	—	—
$A3^3$	257	33	—	—
Total	297	33	93	23
A^4	—	—	58	17
$A1^4$	10	50	—	—
$A2^4$	60	38	—	—
$A3^4$	162	30	—	—
A^5	112	($A2^5$) 49	132	42
Total	344	38	190	35
Total trochaic	1,068	35	403	31
Total lines	1,631	36	1,578	36
Total lines (odd and even)	3,209			

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, William Sidney. 1973. *Accent and Rhythm: Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: A Study in Theory and Reconstruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckman, Nataniel 1899. "Kritische Beiträge zur altnordischen Metrik." *ANF* 15:67-93.

Boer, R. C. 1927. "Om kommentaren til Háttatal." *ANF* 43:262-309.

Boyer, Régis. 1990. "On the Figurative Speech." In *Atti*. Pp. 85-96.

Brennecke, Detlef. 1971. "Zur Metrik der Vellekla." *BGDSL* (T) 93:89-106.

Bugge, Sophus. 1879. "Nogle bidrag til det norröne sprogs og den norröne digtnings historie, hentede fra verslæren." In *Beretning om forhandlingerne på det første nordiske filologmøde i København den 18.-21. juli 1876*. Ed. Ludwig F. A. Wimmer. Copenhagen: Gyldendal. Pp. 140-46.

—. 1888. "Der Gott Bragi in den norrönen Gedichten." *BGDSL* 13:187-201.

—. 1894. *Bidrag til den ældste skaldedigtnings historie*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Bugge, Sophus, and Eduard Sievers. 1891. "Vocalverkürzung im Altnordischen." *BGDSL* 15:391-411.

Clunies Ross, Margaret. 1987. *Skáldskaparmál: Snorri Sturluson's "ars poetica" and Medieval Theories of Language*. Viking Collection: Studies in Northern Civilization, 4. Odense: Odense University Press, 1987.

Craigie, William A. 1900. "On Some Points in Skaldic Metre." *ANF* 16:341-84.

De Geer, Ingrid. 1985. "Earl, Saint, Bishop, Skald — and Music: The Orkney Earldom of the Twelfth Century: A Musicological Study." Diss., Institutionen för musikvetenskap, Uppsala University.

Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Germanische Bibliothek, 4th ser. Vol. 1: *Texte*. 4th rev. ed., ed. Hans Kuhn. Heidelberg: Winter, 1962.

Edwards, Diana C. 1983. "Clause Arrangement in Skaldic Poetry. I: Clause Arrangement in the *Dróttkvætt* Poetry of the Ninth to Fourteenth Centuries. II: Clause Arrangement in the Poetry of Arnórr jarlaskáld." *ANF* 98:123-75.

Edzardi, Anton. 1878. "Die skaldischen Versmasse und ihr Verhältnis zur keltischen (irischen) Verskunst." *BGDSL*, 5:570-89.

Einar Ól. Sveinsson. 1962. *Íslenzkar bókmenntir í fornöld*. Vol. 1. Reykjavík: Almenna bókafélagið.

—. 1975. "Írskur bragarháttur á sveimi um norðurlönd í fornöld." In *Löng er för: þrír þættir um írskar og íslenzkar sögur og kvæði*. Studia Islandica, 34. Reykjavík: Bókaútgáfa Menningarsjóðs. Pp. 173-212.

Engster, Hermann. 1983. *Poesie einer Achsenzeit: Der Ursprung der Skaldik im gesellschaftlichen Systemwandel der Wikingerzeit*. European University Studies, ser. 1: German Language and Literature, 667. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Falk, Hjalmar. 1894. "Om de rimende konsonanter ved helrim i dróttkvætt." *ANF* 10:125-30.

Faulkes, Anthony. 1987. *Snorri Sturluson: Edda*. Everyman Classics, 499. London: Dent.

Fidjestøl, Bjarne. 1982. *Det norrøne fyrstediktet*. Universitetet i Bergen: Nordisk institutts skriftserie, 11. Øvre Ervik: Alvheim & Eide.

—. 1985. "Skaldestudiar: Eit forskingsoversyn." *MM*, pp. 53-81.

Finnur Jónsson. 1890. "Om skjaldepoesien og de ældste skjalde. (To foredrag)." *ANF* 6:121-55.

—. 1892. *Stutt íslenzk bragfræði*. Copenhagen: Møller for Hið íslenzka bókmenntafélag..

—. 1920. *Den oldnorske og oldislandske litteraturs historie*. Vol. 1. 2d ed. Copenhagen: Gad.

—. 1924. "Skjaldekvadenes forståelse." *ANF* 40:320-31.

—. 1929. "Skjaldekvad." *ANF* 45:127-49.

—. 1933. "Kenningers led-omstilling og tmesis." *ANF* 49:1-23.

Fix-Bonner, Hans. 1990. "Sprachliche Studien zu den ältesten isländischen Handschriften." *Habilitationsschrift*, Bonn.

Foote, Peter. 1984. "Beginnings and Endings: Some Notes on the Study of Scaldic Poetry." In *Aurvandilstá: Norse Studies*. Ed. Michael Barnes et al. Viking Collection: Studies in Northern Civilization, 2. Odense: Odense University Press. Pp. 236-48.

Frank, Roberta. 1970. "Onomastic Play in Kormakr's Verse: The Name Steingerðr." *MS* 3:7-34.

—. 1978. *Old Norse Court Poetry: The "Dróttkvætt" Stanza*. Islandica, 42. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

—. 1985. "Skaldic Poetry." In *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature: A Critical Guide*. Ed. Carol J. Clover and John Lindow. Islandica, 45. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Pp. 157-96.

—. 1990. "Why Skalds Address Women." In *Atti*. Pp. 67-83.

Friesen, Otto von. 1920. *Rökstenen: Runstenen vid Röks kyrka Lysings härad Östergötland*. Kungl. Vitterhets- Historie- och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar. Stockholm: Jacob Bagges söner.

Gade, Kari Ellen. 1985. "Skjalf." *ANF* 100:59-71.

—. 1986a. "Skaldic Composition in the *dróttkvætt* Meter." Diss., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

—. 1986b. "Skaldic Light on Open-Syllable Lengthening in Old Icelandic." Unpublished paper delivered to MLA Conference, New York December.

—. 1988. "The Concept of a Syntactic Caesura in Old Norse Dróttkvætt Poetry." In *Semper idem et novus: Festschrift Frank Banta*. Ed. Francis G. Gentry. Göppingen: Kümmerle. Pp. 3-25.

—. 1989. "Hans Kuhn's *Das Dróttkvætt*: Some Critical Considerations." *JEGP* 88:34-53.

—. 1991. "*Fang* and *fall*: Two Skaldic *termini technici*." *JEGP* 90:361-74.

—. 1993. "Review of Kristján Árnason, *The Rhythms of Dróttkvætt and Other Old Icelandic Metres*." *JEGP* 92:273-79.

—. 1994. "On the Recitation of Old Norse Skaldic Poetry." *Studien zum Altgermanischen: Festschrift für Heinrich Beck*. Ed. Heiko Uecker. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertümskunde, 11. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter. Pp. 126-51.

—. n.d. "Snorri Sturluson's *Háttatal*, the Third Grammatical Treatise, and the Problem of Syllabification in Old Norse." In *The Third Symposium of Germanic Linguistics*. Ed. Shaun F. D. Hughes. (To appear)

Genzmer, Felix. 1928. "Zwei angebliche Fälle von Wortspaltung." *ANF* 44:305-11.

—. 1930. "Studien über den Stil der Skalden." In *Deutsche Islandforschung*. I: *Kultur*. Ed. Walther H. Vogt. Veröffentlichungen der Schleswig-Holsteinischen Universitätsgesellschaft, 28:1. Breslau: Hirt. Pp. 143-69.

Gordon, Edward V. 1957. *An Introduction to Old Norse*. 2d rev. ed., ed. A. R. Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon.

Grundtvig, Svend. 1879. In *Beretning om forhandlingerne på det første nordiske filologmøde i København den 18.-21. juli 1876*. Ed. Ludwig F. A. Wimmer. Copenhagen: Gyldendal. Pp. 146-47.

Hamel, A. G. van. 1928-36. "Gods, Skalds, and Magic." *SBVS* 11:129-52.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to Their History*. The great Languages. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Heusler, Andreas. 1941. *Die altgermanische Dichtung*. 1932; 2d ed. Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion.

—. 1956. *Deutsche Versgeschichte mit Einschluss des altenglischen und altnordischen Stabreimverses*. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, 8.1. 2d ed. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hildebrand, Karl. 1874. "Die Versteilung in den Edda-Liedern." *ZDP* (Ergänzungsband). Pp. 74-139.

Hoffory, Julius. 1889. *Eddastudien*. Berlin: Reimer.

Hofmann, Dietrich. 1963. "Die Frage des musikalischen Vortrags der altgermanischen Stabreimdichtung in philologischer Sicht." *ZDA* 92:83-121.

—. 1991. *Die Versstrukturen der altsächsischen Stabreimgedichte Heliand und Genesis*. Vol. 1: *Textband*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hofmann, Dietrich, and Ewald Jammers. 1965. "Zur Frage des Vortrags der altgermanischen Stabreimdichtung." *ZDA* 94:185-95.

Hollander, Lee M. 1947. "Is the Skaldic Stanza a Unit?" *Germanic Review* 22:298-319.

—. 1953. "Some Observations on the *dróttkvætt* Meter of Skaldic Poetry." *JEGP* 52:189-97.

—. 1965. "Observations on the Nature and Function of the Parenthetic Sentence in Skaldic Poetry." *JEGP* 64:635-44.

—. 1968. *The Skalds: A Selection of Their Poems, with Introduction and Notes*. Ann Arbor Paperbacks. 2d ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Jón Helgason. 1953. "Norges og Islands digtning." In *Litteraturhistorie B: Norge og Island*. Nordisk kultur, 8B. Ed. Sigurður Nordal. Stockholm: Bonnier. Pp. 3-179.

Jón Þorkelsson. 1863. *Um r og i í niðrlagi orða og orðstofna í íslenzku*. Reykjavík: Prentsmiðju Íslands.

Kabell, Aage. 1978. *Metrische Studien*. I. *Der Alliterations-vers*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Knott, Eleanor, and Gerard Murphy. 1966. *Early Irish Literature*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Kock, Ernst Albin. 1923-44. *Notationes norrœnæ: Anteckningar till Edda och skaldediktning*. *Lunds universitets årsskrift*, new ser., sec. 1., 19-39. Lund: Gleerup.

—. 1924. "Skaldendichtung und Undeutlichkeit?" In *Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag 19. Juli 1924*. Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer. Pp. 78-83.

—. 1946-49. *Den norsk-isländska skaldediktningen*. 2 vols. Lund: Gleerup.

Koller, Georg. 1939. "Der Beruf des Skalden." Diss., Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Berlin. Berlin: Rudolph Pfau.

Konráð Gíslason. 1872. *Nogle Bemærkninger om Skjaldedigtenes Beskaffenhed i formel Henseende*. Videnskabsselskabets skrifter, ser. 5, Historisk og philosophisk Afdeling, vol. 4, no. 7. (1872) Copenhagen. Pp. 283-315.

Korin, Marlyn Waggener. 1969. "An Analysis of Skaldic Poetry." Diss., George Washington University.

Krause, Wolfgang. 1930. *Die Kenning als typische Stilfigur der germanischen und keltischen Dichtersprache*. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 7. Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 1. Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer.

Kreutzer, Gert. 1977. *Die Dichtungslehre der Skalden: Poetologische Terminologie und Autorenkommentare als Grundlage einer Gattungspoetik*. 2d ed. Hochschulschriften: Literaturwissenschaft, 1. Meisenheim am Glahn: Anton Hain.

Kristensen, Marius. 1928. "Tvískelft-skjálfhenda." In *Festskrift til Finnur Jónsson 29. maj 1928*. Ed. Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen et al. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard. Pp. 274-82.

Kristján Árnason. 1980. *Quantity in Historical Phonology: Icelandic and Related Cases*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1987. "Um hendingar í dróttkvæðum hætti." *Íslenzk mál og almenn málfræði* 9:41-69.

—. 1991. *The Rhythms of Dróttkvætt and Other Old Icelandic Metres*. Reykjavík: Institute of Linguistics.

Krömmelbein, Thomas. 1983. *Skaldische Metaphorik: Studien zur Funktion der Kenning-sprache in den skaldischen Dichtungen des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts*. Hochschul-Produktionen: Germanistik-Linguistik-Literaturwissenschaft, 7. Kirchzarten: Burg-Verlag.

Kuhn, Hans. 1929. "Review of Konstantin Reichardt, *Studien zu den Skalden des neunten und zehnten Jahrhunderts*." *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 191:193-202. Reprinted in *KS*, 1:421-29.

—. 1933. "Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen." *BGDSL* 57:1-109. Reprinted in *KS*, 1:18-103.

—. 1934. "Die Skaldendichtung." In *Germanische Philologie: Ergebnisse und Aufgaben: Festschrift für Otto Behaghel*. Ed. Alfred Goetze et al. Heidelberg: Winter. Pp. 411-18. Reprinted in *KS*, 1:439-46.

—. 1937. "Zum Vers- und Satzbau der Skalden." *ZDA* 74:49-63. Reprinted in *KS*, 1:468-84.

—. 1939. "Westgermanisches in der altnordischen Verskunst." *BGDSL* 63:178-236. Reprinted in *KS*, 1:485-527.

—. 1969a. "Von Bragi bis Snorri: Zur Geschichte des Dróttkvætts." In *Einarsbók:Afmæliskveðja til Einars Ól. Sveinssonar 12. desember 1969*. Ed. Bjarni Guðnason, Halldór Halldórsson, and Jónas Kristjánsson. Reykjavík: Nokkrir vinir, 1969. Pp. 211-32. Reprinted in *KS*, 4:117-32.

—. 1969b. "Die Dróttkvættverse des Typs 'brestr erfiði Austra'." In *Afmælisrit Jóns Helgasonar 30. júní 1969*. Ed. Jakob Benediktsson et al. Reykjavík: Heimskringla. Pp. 403-17. Reprinted in *KS*, 4:105-16.

—. 1969c. "Die Dróttkvættstrophe als Kunstwerk." In *Festschrift für Konstantin Reichardt*. Ed. Christian Gellinek. Bern and Munich: Francke. Pp. 63-72. Reprinted in *KS*, 4:95-104.

—. 1977. "Hendingstudien." In *Sjötíu ritgerðir helgaðar Jakobi Benediktssyni 20. júlí 1977*. Ed. Einar G. Pétursson and Jónas Kristjánsson. Vol. 2. Stofnun Árna Magnússonar á Íslandi, Rit 12. Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar. Pp. 517-32.

—. 1983. *Das Dróttkvætt*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1956. *The Development of Germanic Verse Form*. Austin: University of Texas Press and Linguistic Society of America.

Lie, Hallvard. 1952. "Skaldestil-studier." *MM*, pp. 1-92.

Lindow, John. 1975. "Riddles, Kennings, and the Complexity of Skaldic Poetry." *SS* 47:311-27.

Lönnroth, Lars. 1971. "Hjálmar's Death-Song and the Delivery of Eddic Poetry." *Speculum* 46:1-20.

Mackenzie, Bridget Gordon. 1981. "On the Relation of Norse Skaldic Verse to Irish Syllabic Poetry." In *Speculum Norrœnum: Norse Studies in Memory of Gabriel Turville-Petre*. Ed. Ursula Dronke et al. Odense: Odense University Press, 1981. Pp. 337-56.

Marold, Edith. 1976. "Skaldendichtung und bildende Kunst der Wikingerzeit." In *Festgabe für Otto Höfler zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. Helmut Birkhahn. Philologica Germanica, 3. Vienna: Braumüller. Pp. 449-78.

—. 1983. *Kenningkunst: Ein Beitrag zu einer Poetik der Skaldendichtung*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, new ser., 80. Berlin: de Gruyter.

—. 1986. "Ragnarsdrápa und Ragnarssage: Versuch einer Interpretation der Ragnarsdrápa." In *Germanic Dialects: Linguistic and Philological Investigations*. Ed. Bela Brogyanyi and Thomas Krömmelbein. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, ser. 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 38. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Pp. 427-57.

—. 1990. "Skaldendichtung und Mythologie." In *Atti*. Pp. 107-30.

Moberg, Ove. 1942-43. "Den fornnordiska skaldediktningens uppkomst: Ett bidrag." *APS* 16:193-211.

Mogk, Eugen. 1889. "Dróttkvætt." *ANF*, 5:108-9.

Mohr, Wolfgang. 1933. *Kenningstudien: Beiträge zur Stilgeschichte der altgermanischen Dichtung*. Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten, 19. Sonderreihe: Studien zur nordischen Philologie, 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Murphy, Gerard. 1973. *Early Irish Metrics*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.

Noreen, Adolf. 1970. *Altnordische Grammatik*. I: *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*. 5th ed. Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, A.4. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Noreen, Erik. 1922. *Studier i fornvästnordisk diktning: Andra samlingen*. Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1922: Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskapar, 4. Uppsala: A-B. akademiska bokhandeln. Pp. 1-77.

O'Donoughue, Heather. 1991. *The Genesis of a Saga Narrative: Verse and Prose in "Kormaks Saga."* Oxford English Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ohlmarks, Åke. 1944. "Till frågan om den fornnordiska skaldediktningens ursprung." *ANF* 57:178-207.

Olafsen, John (Jón Ólafsson *Hypnonensius*). 1786. *Om nordens gamle digtekonst dens grundregler, versarter, sprog og foredragsmaade: Et priisskrift.* Copenhagen: Det kongelige Videnskabers Selskab.

Pipping, Hugo. 1903a. *Bidrag till eddametriken.* Skrifter utgifna af svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 59. Helsingfors: Tidnings- & Tryckeri-Aktiebolagets Tryckeri.

—. 1903b. "Kvantitet och dynamisk accent." *Språk och stil* 3:112-22.

—. 1937. *Studier i metrik och prosodi.* Studier i nordisk filologi: Skrifter utg. av svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 27, no. 2. Helsingfors: Mercator.

Poole, Russell G. 1990. "Skaldic Praise Poetry as a Marginal Form." In *Atti.* Pp. 169-85.

—. 1991. *Viking Poems on War and Peace: A Study in Skaldic Narrative.* Toronto Medieval Texts and Translation, 8. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Portengen, Alberta J. 1915. *De oudgermaansche dichtertaal in haar ethnologisch verband.* Leiden: van Nifterik.

Reichardt, Konstantin. 1928. *Studien zu den Skalden des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts.* Palaestra, 159. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller.

—. 1930. "Beiträge zur Skaldenforschung I-II." *ANF* 46:32-62, 199-258.

—. 1962. "Skaldisches." In *Festgabe für L. L. Hammerich aus Anlass seines siebzigsten Geburtstags.* Copenhagen: Naturmetodens sproginstitut. Pp. 245-54.

—. 1969. "A Contribution to the Interpretation of Skaldic Poetry: Tmesis." In *Old Norse Literature and Mythology: A Symposium.* Ed. Edgar C. Polomé. Austin: University of Texas Press. Pp. 200-226.

Reinskou, Finn. 1924. "Snorri und die Skaldenmetrik." In *Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag 19. Juli 1924.* Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer. Pp. 66-77.

Rieger, Max. 1876. "Die alt- und angelsächsische Verskunst." *ZDP* 7:1-64.

Schwarz, Hans. 1955-56. "Über skaldische Wortwahl." *Wirkendes Wort* 6:257-62.

See, Klaus von. 1964. "Skop und Skald: Zur Auffassung des Dichters bei den Germanen." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 45:1-14. Reprinted in *ESS,* pp. 347-60.

—. 1967. *Germanische Verskunst.* Sammlung Metzler, 67. Stuttgart: Metzler.

—. 1968. "Skothending: Bemerkungen zur Frühgeschichte des skaldischen Binnen-reims." *BGDSL* (T) 90:217-22. Reprinted in *ESS,* pp. 361-66.

—. 1977. "Skaldenstrophe und Sagaprosa: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der mündlichen Überlieferung in der altnordischen Literatur." *MS* 10:58-82. Reprinted in *ESS,* pp. 461-85.

—. 1980. *Skaldendichtung: Eine Einführung.* Munich: Artemis.

Sievers, Eduard. 1878. "Beiträge zur Skaldenmetrik." *BGDSL* 5:449-518.

—. 1885a. "Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses I-II." *BGDSL,* 10:209-314, 451-545.

—. 1885b. *Proben einer metrischen Herstellung der Eddalieder.* Tübingen: L. F. Fues.

—. 1893. *Altgermanische Metrik.* Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. Ergänzungsreihe 2. Halle: Niemeyer.

Sigurður Nordal. 1931-32. "Icelandic Notes. I: Drápa." *APS* 6:144-49.

Smith, Emil. 1918. "Gude- og dæmonsprog." *MM,* pp. 9-18.

Steblin-Kamenskij, M. I. 1946. "Drevneislanskij poètičeskij termin 'dróttkvætt.'" *Naučnyj bjulleten' Leningradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta* 6:21-24.

—. 1969. "On the Etymology of the Word Skáld." *Afmælisrit Jóns Helgasonar 30. júní 1969*. Ed. Jakob Benediktsson et al. Reykjavík: Heimskringla. Pp. 421-30.

Stefán Einarsson. 1963. "Harp Song Heroic Poetry (Chadwicks) Greek and Germanic Alternate Singing: Mantic Song in Lapp Legend Eddas, Sagas, and Sturlunga." *Budkavlen* 42:13-28.

Sveinbjörn Egilsson. 1966. *Lexicon Poeticum Antiquæ Linguæ septentrionalis*. 2d rev. ed., ed. Finnur Jónsson. Copenhagen: Atlas.

Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1891. *Mittelirische Verslehren*. Irische Texte mit Übersetzungen und Wörterbuch. 3rd ser., 1. Leipzig: Hirzel. Pp. 1-182.

Turville-Petre, E. O. G. 1944. "Gísli Súrsson and His Poetry: Traditions and Influence." *Modern Language Review* 39:374-91.

—. 1971. "On the Poetry of the Scalds and of the Filid." *Ériu* 22:2-22. English translation of his "Um dróttkvæði og írskan kveðskap." *Skírnir* 128 (1954):31-55. Reprinted as "*Dróttkvætt* and Irish Syllabic Measures" in his 1972 *Nine Norse Studies*. Viking Society Text Series, 5. London: Viking Society for Northern Research. Pp. 154-80.

—. 1976. *Scaldic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Turville-Petre, Joan. 1969. "The Metre of Icelandic Court Poetry." *SBVS* 17:326-51.

Vogt, Walther H. 1937-38. "Binnenreime in der Edda." *APS* 12: 228-62.

Vries, Jan de. 1941. *Altnordische Literaturgeschichte*. Vol. 1. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.

—. 1957. "Les rapports des poésies Scaldique et Gaélique." *Ogam* 9:13-26.

Wadstein, Elis. 1895. "Bidrag till tolkning ock belysning av skalde- ock Edda dikter." *ANF* 11:64-92.

Wessén, Elias. 1958. *Runstenen vid Röks kyrka*. Kungl. Vitterhets- Historie- och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar: Filologisk-filosofiska serien, 5. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

—. 1964. "Theoderikmyt eller hjältesaga? Svar till professor Höfler." *ANF* 79:1-20.

Wood, Cecil. 1952. "A Contribution to a System of Skaldic Word Order." Diss., Yale University.

INDEX